

Modern Philology

VOL. VII

July, 1909

No. 1

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE USE OF PROSE IN THE ENGLISH DRAMA: 1660-1800

To a superficial observer, sufficiently unfamiliar with the matter to take its form for granted, the most striking difference between the English drama of our times and that of the period of Shakspeare would be the relative preponderance of prose and verse. In the Elizabethan drama prose was exceptional; in the modern drama verse is exceptional. When and how did the change take place? Was it by accident, or of such an organic character as to be of historical significance? Does the relation of the two methods suggest anything as to the ideal form for dramatic expression? These are questions which seem never to have been definitely treated.

In the Elizabethan age, then, verse was the standard medium of dramatic expression, whether in comedy or tragedy, and any departure from the norm is usually to be explained as definite and intentional. The usual explanation of the change is a commonplace: when the dramatist wished to *lower the level* of action or expression, from romantic to humorous, from ideal to colloquial, or (less frequently) from emotional to merely intellectual, he introduced prose, and when he wished to lift the action or expression again to the normally idealized plane of the dramatic form, he returned to verse. Two examples from Shakspeare exemplify this as well as would a dozen: one of them from Act I, scene ii of *I Henry IV*, in which the Prince, after dallying with Falstaff and

his other fellows of doubtful respectability, suddenly returns, on the exit of Poins, to his real self and his princely speech—

I know you all, and will awhile uphold
The unyok'd humour of your idleness;

the other from Act III, scene ii, of *Julius Caesar*, where the purely reasonable speech of Brutus is in prose, the emotional appeal of Antony in verse. In many plays of the period (for example, Beaumont and Fletcher's *Knight of the Burning Pestle*) the same change repeatedly indicates the contrast between the levels of two different but interwoven plots.

When we pass to the next important period, that of the Restoration drama, we find that, despite the many changes in both content and style, the old rule of form still holds good on the whole. Dryden is here, as in all respects, the chief and most typical figure. In his *Marriage à la Mode* verse and prose indicate the two utterly different plots and motifs which go to make up that clever compound of Restorationism and romantic beauty; and in *The Spanish Friar*, a tragi-comedy, the two forms indicate in the same way the interwoven elements. But while the old rule remains, new conditions make the application of it give very different results, so that a glance at the whole body of Dryden's plays shows that the relative preponderance of prose and verse has already shifted conspicuously.

This shifting is clearly due to the new conception of comedy which was altering, in the age of Dryden, the fundamental lines of division between the various dramatic types. The romantic spirit was no longer equally characteristic of comedy and tragedy; on the contrary, while the latter was still thought of as a poetic idealization of life (so, also, the heroic play), comedy was becoming largely realistic, and was held to represent life—if one may say so—on a lower level. Dryden expresses this view, at least by implication, in his discussion of the use of rhyme on the stage in the *Essay of Heroic Plays*: "It is very clear to all who understand poetry, that serious plays ought not to imitate conversation too nearly" (Ker ed., i, 148). The heroic play is a representation of Nature "wrought up to an higher pitch" (*ibid.*, p. 100). With comedy—this is the obvious converse—it is otherwise.

It followed naturally, since comedy was thus becoming unideal, unromantic, and of a low colloquial level, that it should make a much larger use of prose and slighter use of verse. So, in Dryden's typically Restoration comedies, like *The Wild Gallant*, *An Evening's Love*, and their fellows, there is practically no verse; and it is only in the early play of *The Rival Ladies*, which is strongly romantic in tone (and is, in fact, a tragi-comedy), that verse predominates to the other extreme. Tragedies and heroic plays are of course not now under consideration, as it seems more convenient to proceed with the history of comedy by itself.

Dryden's best-known contemporaries used even less verse than he, because they had less need of it. Wycherley and Congreve wrote their comedies altogether in prose,¹ for there was no gleam of romance or idealism in them to require anything above the level of prose presentation. Of the minor playwrights Mrs. Aphra Behn is perhaps the most interesting for our purposes, since, more than any of her contemporaries, she was disposed to mingle romantic elements in her plays, and therefore was led to a conflict in the choice of forms. In *The Amorous Prince*, a genuinely romantic comedy, verse is the principal vehicle; in the purely low and realistic plays, like *Sir Patient Fancy* and *The Widow Ranter*, prose appears almost alone; while in *The Rover*, *The Town Fop*, and *The Younger Brother* both prose and verse are used, with a discrimination of their functions quite according to tradition. In a single play, *The Dutch Lover*, we find prose occasionally used where we should expect verse. Thus in Act II, scene iv, occurs a speech like this, in a scene where verse is also used:

Oh how he kills me! Well, at least this pleasure I have whilst I am dying, that when he possesses the fair Cleonte, he for ever ruins his interest in her heart, and must find nothing but her mortal hate and scorn.—*Plays, Histories, and Novels of Mrs. Behn* (1871), I, 236.

Of itself this instance is trivial enough, and might well be passed over, especially in a play which deserves oblivion even above others of its group; but the point becomes of interest because it would seem that what happened here is just what we shall see

¹ The only possible exception may be found in Wycherley's *Plain Dealer*, where blank verse seems to appear in three short soliloquies in I, i, and III, i. (See in Mermaid ed., pp. 392, 428, 431.) In the first instance the verse is of very doubtful character.

presently happened elsewhere—that when prose had become the familiar vehicle of comedy because of reasons inherent in the character of the comedy, it began also to usurp the place of verse in scenes whose tone did *not* demand it.

In the earlier eighteenth-century period Vanbrugh and Farquhar carried on the Restoration tradition. Their usual manner is well represented by Vanbrugh's *Relapse* (1697), which is entirely in prose with the exception of the opening scene, an ironically romantic passage. But Vanbrugh also uses prose in the romantic comedy of *The Mistake* (1705)—sometimes of a quasi-rhythmical character, as in Camillo's soliloquy (Act V, scene i):

How miserable a perplexity have I brought myself into! Yet why do I complain, since, with all the dreadful torture I endure, I can't repent of one wild step I've made? Oh, love! what tempests canst thou raise, what storms canst thou assuage! To all thy cruelties I am resigned; long years through seas of torment I'm content to roll, so thou wilt guide me to the happy port of my Lorenzo's arms, and bless me there with one calm day at last.—*British Theatre*, XXV, 69.

At the conclusion of the same play are speeches of which one wonders whether they should not be printed as blank verse. A similar use of this heightened, romantic prose, in this instance breaking into actual verse, is found at the close of Farquhar's *Inconstant* (1702) (Ewald ed. of Farquhar, I, 419-21).

Further progress in the same direction is marked by the work of Colley Cibber, who may be regarded as the common denominator, for the drama, of the ages of Congreve, Addison, and Johnson. Cibber always preferred prose for comedy, no matter how serious his intent, yet at times evidently felt the need of verse to lift his material to the proper level. Of this the best example is *The Refusal* (1721), all in prose save the love scene between Granger and Sophronia (V, i), where verse seems to have been felt to be indispensable to the depicting of passion. In the earlier play, *Love Makes a Man* (1701), may be found more of the rhythmical prose or bastard verse of which we have already seen a specimen in Vanbrugh. See, for example, such a speech as that of Carlos (V, ii):

Do not debase your generous revenge with cruelty; that every common wretch can take: the savage brutes can suck their fellow-creature's blood, and tear their bodies down; but greater human souls have more pride to curb, and bow the stubborn mind of what they hate; and such revenge, the nobler far, I offer now to you; see at your feet my humbled scorn imploring, crushed, and prostrate, like a vile slave, that falls below your last contempt, and trembling begs for mercy.—*British Theatre*, VII, 102.

There is much more like this, but extended quotation will readily be excused. Most of Cibber's other comedies are wholly in prose, except for the general use of couplet tags and the like; and since in many of them no little romantic feeling is involved, the dominions of prose are seen to have tended steadily to widen.

At the same time with Cibber, Richard Steele was promoting this tendency in his "sentimental" comedies.¹ The conditions in the two cases are almost the same. Thus *The Funeral* (1701) is for the most part written in purely realistic prose, but in the coffin scene (V, iv) we pass through prose of a heightened character (such as "How shall I view, a breathless lump of clay, him whose high veins conveyed to me this vital force and motion?") to genuine blank verse. The same vehicle is used for the didactic, Polonius-like speech of Lord Brumpton, a little later in the same scene, and, it might be added, in the brief lyrical passage on the death of a squirrel, in scene iii. *The Lying Lover* (1703) shows a similar commingling of romantic prose and casual blank verse in the last scene (new Mermaid ed. of Steele's plays, pp. 178-84), while in other scenes occurs the same doubtful rhythmical prose that we have met in Cibber. For example:

She smiled; the ladies clapped their hands, and all our music struck sympathetic rapture at my happiness; while gentle winds, the river, air, and shore echoed the harmony in notes more soft than they received it. Methought all nature seemed to die for love like me. To all my heart and every pulse beat time.—*Ibid.*, p. 118. See also 130 f. and 170 f.

¹ He is usually spoken of as the founder of the form, and perhaps rightly enough. But *Love Makes a Man* exhibits some of the same peculiarities, especially this quasi-romantic prose. Its precise date does not seem to be known, but Steele's *Funeral* was produced late in 1701, and is therefore probably the later of the two plays. Since Cibber's comedies were very numerous, and were fairly popular through a long period, he may fairly be regarded as the leading factor in the new type of comic prose.

In *The Tender Husband* (1705), which is satiric in tone, prose is used throughout; and the same thing is true of *The Conscious Lovers* (1722), though this play is again of the sentimental type. For the most part even the romantic elements here are presented in a realistic and fairly pedestrian prose, occasionally rising into passages for which dramatists of the older school would have demanded verse.

From this time on verse becomes almost an entire stranger to comedy. Foote, Whitehead, Colman, Garrick, Kelly, and Cumberland, who, with Goldsmith, represent the original comedy of the period from 1750 to 1780, wrote wholly in prose.¹ In general this triumph of prose marks the triumph of the *familiar* comedy; but, as we have seen, the form held good even where the romantic note was also present. Goldsmith illustrates both statements. *The Goodnatured Man* and *She Stoops to Conquer* are both worked out on the familiar level and in colloquial prose; in the latter, when we reach a fairly romantic scene, we still find the kind of prose—intended to be at once realistic and romantic—which the comedy of the century had been developing:

Miss Hardecastle. Do you think I would take the mean advantage of a transient passion, to load you with confusion? Do you think I could ever relish that happiness which was acquired by lessening yours?

Marlowe. By all that's good, I can have no happiness but what's in your power to grant me! Nor shall I ever feel repentance but in not having seen your merits before. I will stay even contrary to your wishes; and although you should persist to shun me, I will make my respectful assiduities atone for the levity of my past conduct.—Globe ed. of Goldsmith, p. 675.

The lovers of Sheridan rise to higher reaches than this, though still on the ground of prose. When Julia cries:

Then on the bosom of your wedded Julia, you may lull your keen regret to slumbering; while virtuous love, with a cherub's hand, shall smooth the brow of upbraiding thought, and pluck the thorn from compunction.—*The Rivals*, V, i.

or, in her concluding outburst, tells us that

¹ That is, of course, in comedy. Whitehead and Cumberland used verse for their serious plays.

when hearts deserving happiness would unite their fortunes, Virtue would crown them with an unfading garland of modest hurtless flowers,¹ we feel more than ever that prose is laboring under a weight too heavy for it, and, while trying at once to achieve realism and romance, is in great danger of losing both.

Let us now retrace our steps to see whether any similar movement was going on in tragedy. In the Restoration period, as has been noted, tragedy was still treated as an elevated and poetic form; and even Congreve, the most skilled of the writers of comic prose in that age, wrote his one tragedy, *The Mourning Bride*, entirely in verse. Dryden, too, used no tragic prose, save in the one extraordinary and repulsive play of *Amboyna*, in which a contemporary incident was realistically dramatized. In this tragedy occurs a colloquial prose, varied at times by bastard verse (printed as prose), which anticipates the worst efforts of the sort in the eighteenth century drama. (For instances, see the Scott-Saintsbury ed. of Dryden, V, 22, 41, 51.) The performance must be regarded, however, as a mere aberration, without significance for the tendencies of the time. Crowne and Southerne, while using prose freely for interspersed scenes in the comic or colloquial manner (see for examples the *Regulus* of Crowne and the *Oroonoko* of Southerne), wrote the serious scenes of their tragedies wholly in verse. The same is true of Otway and (passing into the next century) of Rowe. Even Cibber used verse for all his tragedies and for the pastoral play called *Love in a Riddle*. Ambrose Philips' *Distressed Mother* (1712) and Addison's *Cato* (1713), the favorite tragedies of the second decade of the century, were wholly in verse, as were those of Young and Thomson a little later.

But the rise of the "domestic" drama was destined to affect the form of tragedy also. It seems to be George Lillo to whom belongs the doubtful honor of first writing an English tragedy in prose—*George Barnwell* (1731), for a long time a famous play. That the choice of the form was deliberate we cannot doubt, since

¹ It has occasionally been suggested that these romantic passages in Sheridan's comedies are not to be taken seriously—that he was laughing in his sleeve as he wrote them. Perhaps he was; but I see no evidence that he intended the reader to laugh as he read them; and certain other appearances of Sheridan's romantic prose (see below) tend to oppose such a view.

it harmonizes so clearly with the choice of theme and style. In the Dedication (addressed to an Alderman of the City, as if Lillo were resolved to be consistently *bourgeois* in every part) the dramatist said:

I have attempted, indeed, to enlarge the province of the graver kind of poetry, and should be glad to see it carried on by some abler hand. Plays founded on moral tales in private life may be of admirable use; etc.

It appears, then, that he regarded the play as included in the field of "poetry" in the large sense of the word. The form shows the same wavering between the feeling of a need for rhythm and the desire to represent actual human speech, which we saw in the contemporary comedies of Cibber and Steele. Sometimes prose is sufficient, as here:

As doubts and fears, followed by reconciliation, ever increase love where the passion is sincere, so in him it caused so wild a transport of excessive fondness, such joy, such grief, such pleasure, and such anguish, that nature seemed sinking with the weight, and his charmed soul disposed to quit his breast for hers.—III, ii; *British Theatre*, XIV, 51.

At other times rhythm becomes clearer:

Truman. Shall fortune sever those whom friendship joined? Thy miseries cannot lay thee so low, but love will find thee. Here will we offer to stern calamity; this place the altar, and ourselves the sacrifice. Our mutual groans shall echo to each other through the dreary vault; our sighs shall number the moments as they pass, and mingling tears communicate such anguish, as words were never made to express.

Barnwell. Then be it so. Since you propose an intercourse of woe, pour all your griefs into my breast and in exchange take mine. Where's now the anguish that you promised? You've taken mine, and make me no return. Sure peace and comfort dwell within these arms, and sorrow can't approach me while I am here.—V, ii; *ibid.*, 81.

There are also in this closing act lines which for short periods might well be printed as verse.

In Lillo's later tragedy, *The Fatal Curiosity* (1736), although the theme is again domestic, the medium of expression is blank verse. His *Arden of Feversham* and *Marina* are also chiefly in verse, and the remaining tragedies or tragi-comedies, *The Christian Hero* and *Elmerick*, wholly in verse. But his chief successor in the domestic drama, Edward Moore, followed the example set

by *George Barnwell*, and in *The Gamester* (1753) produced the most completely realistic tragedy which had yet been written. Here prose is used throughout, and prose which only occasionally shows a disposition to break into rhythm. Even where it reaches the highest emotional intensity, it is kept genuinely colloquial with a skill not shown in any of the work we have seen hitherto. See, for example, the soliloquy of the hero at the time of his suicide:

How the self-murderer's account may stand, I know not. But this I know—the load of hateful life oppresses me too much—the horrors of my soul are more than I can bear. Father of mercy!—I cannot pray. Despair has laid his iron hand upon me, and sealed me for perdition. Conscience! conscience! thy clamours are too loud—here's that shall silence thee. Thou art most friendly to the miserable. Come, then, thou cordial for sick minds—come to my heart.—V, iv; *British Theatre*, X, 86.

A priori one would have expected a considerable further development in this direction following the lines already indicated by comedy. But this did not prove to be the case. The old dignity of tragedy could not be overthrown; moreover, if people wanted familiar life treated seriously, they now had the new form of the realistic novel to satisfy them. So the later eighteenth-century writers of tragedy, like Whitehead, Home, and Cumberland, not to speak of Dr. Johnson and his *Irene*, all turned to the earlier type for both style and verse-form. The only noteworthy exceptions are found in two or three romantic plays—tragi-comedies rather than pure tragedies—written under German influence, and dating from the very end of the century. Thus in the dramatized version of Godwin's *Caleb Williams*, written by George Colman the younger and called *The Iron Chest* (1796), prose is used indiscriminately for serious passages, at the same time with verse. In *The Castle Spectre* (1797), by M. G. Lewis, author of *The Monk*, prose is used throughout. The style of the more romantic scenes of the latter play may be exemplified by this passage from Act IV, scene ii:

Angela. Sure an age must have elapsed since the Friar left me, and still the bell strikes not One! Percy, does thy impatience equal mine? Dost thou too count the moments which divide us? Dost thou too chide the slowness of Time's pinions, which moved so swiftly when we strayed

together on the Cheviot Hills? Methinks I see him now, as he paces the Conway's margin; if a leaf falls, if a bird flutters, he flies toward it, for he thinks 'tis the footstep of Angela; then, with slow steps and bending head, disappointed he regains the fisher's cottage. . . . Oh! sigh no more, my Percy. Soon shall I repose in safety on your bosom; soon again see the moon shed her silver light on Cheviot, and hear its green hills repeat the carol of your mellow horn!

Finally we may note Sheridan's adaptation of Kotzebue's *Spaniards in Peru*, produced under the title *Pizarro* in 1799—a romantic tragedy. Of the style of this play one of Sheridan's editors observes:

Long practice in the ornate rhetoric of the House of Commons had told severely on Sheridan's style. Indeed, some of the dialogue in the play is actually culled from his parliamentary utterances. Pitt said that he had heard the tragedy already—in the Begum speech.—R. Dircks, in *Camelot* ed. of Sheridan's plays, Introduction, p. xxviii.

A typical passage from *Pizarro*, illustrative of this tendency to the oratorical style, is this from the conclusion of the third act:

Yes, thou undaunted!—thou whom yet no mortal hazard has appalled—thou who on Panama's brow didst make alliance with the raging elements that tore the silence of that horrid night, when thou didst follow, as thy pioneer, the crashing thunder's drift; and, stalking o'er the trembling earth, didst plant thy banner by the red volcano's mouth! thou who, when battling on the sea, and thy brave ship was blown to splinters, wast seen, as thou didst bestride a fragment of the smoking wreck, to wave thy glittering sword above thy head, as thou wouldst defy the world in that extremity!—come, fearless man! now meet the last and fellest peril of thy life; meet and survive an injured woman's fury.—*Camelot* ed., p. 304. (Compare similar passages on pp. 285, 305.)

This is clearly a hybrid style, which lacks the rhythm needed to support its emotional intensity, lacks the rational element necessary for legitimate oratorical prose, and lacks the element of realism necessary for the dramatic representation of human speech. In connection with this incidental appearance of the question of the oratorical style as related to prose and poetry, it may be worth while to recall an interesting remark of Hazlitt's, in a passage descriptive of the style of Burke; "the most perfect prose style," he calls it, "the most dazzling, that which went the nearest to the verge of poetry, and yet never fell over." Then this:

It differs from poetry, as I conceive, like the chamois from the eagle: it climbs to an almost equal height, touches upon a cloud, overlooks a precipice, . . . but all the while, instead of soaring through the air, it stands upon a rocky cliff, clambers up by abrupt and intricate ways.—“The Prose Style of Poets,” in *The Plain Speaker*, Waller-Glover ed. of Hazlitt, VII, 10.

Like the mountain chamois, then, prose may reach heights which cannot be distinguished from those attained by poetry, but in doing so it must keep its feet on the ground, and proceed by pedestrian processes. Carrying on the figure (which is genuinely illustrative, not merely fanciful), one might say that rhythm represents the wings of poetry—the sign of its imaginative process; they permit and justify its directer and less earthy mode of motion.

The historical survey of our subject cannot at present be continued into the nineteenth century. Owing to the persistent separation, during that period in England, of the literary and the acted drama, such a study would necessarily mean something different from what it does for the earlier centuries. So far as the literary drama is concerned, it has of course been largely tragedy, following the traditional form of verse. On the other hand, the acted drama has been largely comedy, and, whether primarily realistic or romantic, it has generally taken the form determined for it in the eighteenth century—prose. In the case of the few dramatists who have written plays both to be acted and to be read, like Bulwer-Lytton, for example, the old distinction has usually been followed—verse for serious or romantic scenes, prose for colloquial or comic.¹ But there has been on the one hand so little genuinely romantic comedy, and on the other so little genuine tragedy outside the closet drama, that the materials for any inductive generalization are largely wanting.

It remains, then, only to summarize the results of our survey of the conditions of the eighteenth-century drama, and to suggest some theoretical considerations which the historical materials have served to illustrate. The gist of the whole matter has been this: verse was gradually abandoned for comedy, first because the

¹As exceptions to the prevalent fashion one may recall such comedies as Boker's *Betrothal*, Gilbert's *Wicked World* and *Pygmalion and Galatea*, and (very recently) Mr. Mackaye's *Canterbury Pilgrims*—all written in verse, even in the more familiar scenes.

romantic spirit died out from comedy in the interest of a purely descriptive or satiric presentation of human life, and prose afterward held the field even when the romantic element occasionally returned. A similar effort was made to win tragedy for prose, in the interest of the realistic treatment of human suffering, but failed.

As the case is somewhat clearer for tragedy, it will be well to consider this first on the theoretical side. Prose has never proved a fit vehicle for English tragedy; not only has it failed to establish itself, but there is not a single example of a lastingly important prose tragedy in the language. If we seek for the fundamental reason, it may be stated under three aspects: for tragic art, prose is too homely, too crude, and too individual.

The term "homely" has reference simply to the matter of dialogue style. Tragedy, by nature and tradition, is a form of the greatest dignity, dealing with profound problems of emotional and imaginative significance. Prose style, within its normal limits, is inadequate to represent these. We have seen what has happened when it has tried to do so: either it has encroached on the region of verse, and adopted a bastard or hybrid form, or it has encroached on the region of poetical style, laboring under imaginative language which it is ill suited to carry, with a resulting pseudo-oratorical or melodramatic effect. But, it may be asked, since tragedy deals after all with the real emotions of human experience, and since in the case of individual experiences we normally express these emotions in prose, why may not the dramatist imitate this familiar human language?

The second and third points are the answer to this question. If the dramatist tries to represent tragic conditions, whether in dialogue or otherwise, precisely as they are found in real life, he presents too crudely the raw materials of tragedy, and the result is likely to be painful instead of exalting. On this point it will suffice to call two important witnesses, Wordsworth and Goethe. In the Preface to the second edition of the *Lyrical Ballads*, seeking for various justifications for the metrical form of poetry despite his general doctrine that poetry does not *per se* require a different medium of expression from prose, Wordsworth says:

From the tendency of meter to divest language, in a certain degree, of its reality, and thus to throw a sort of half-consciousness of unsubstantial existence over the whole composition, there can be little doubt but that more pathetic situations and sentiments—that is, those which have a greater proportion of pain connected with them—may be endured in metrical composition. . . . This opinion may be further illustrated by appealing to the reader's own experience of the reluctance with which he comes to the reperusal of the distressful parts of *Clarissa Harlowe*, or *The Gamester*; while Shakspeare's writings, in the most pathetic scenes, never act upon us as pathetic beyond the bounds of pleasure—an effect which, in a much greater degree than might at first be imagined, is to be ascribed to small, but continual and regular impulses of pleasurable surprise from the metrical arrangement.—Globe ed. of Wordsworth, p. 858.

Of Wordsworth's psychological theory here there may be some question, but the important point is the testimony as to the æsthetic effect of verse in connection with tragic material. Now compare Goethe, who was discussing the same subject with Schiller in 1797 and 1798. (This was nearly twenty years earlier than Wordsworth's second Preface, written in 1815, but there is no probability that Wordsworth knew anything directly of the Letters.) On May 5, 1798, we find Goethe writing, à propos of the progress of his work on *Faust*:

Ein sehr sonderbarer Fall erscheint dabei: einige tragische Scenen¹ waren in Prosa geschrieben, sie sind durch ihre Natürlichkeit und Stärke, in Verhältniss gegen das andere, ganz unerträglich. Ich suche sie deswegen gegenwärtig in Reime zu bringen, da denn die Idee, wie durch einen Flor durchscheint, die unmittelbare Wirkung des ungeheuern Stoffes aber gedämpft wird.—Letter 457, *Briefwechsel zwischen Schiller und Goethe*, ed. of 1881, II, 66. (My attention was originally directed to this letter by a note in Professor Gummere's *The Beginnings of Poetry*, p. 73.)

To which Schiller responded, on May 8:

Ihre neuliche Bemerkung, dass die Ausführung einiger tragischen Scenen in Prosa so gewaltsam angreifend ausgefallen, bestätigt eine ältere Erfahrung die Sie bei der Mariane im Meister gemacht haben, wo gleichfalls der pure Realism in einer pathetischen Situation so heftig wirkt, und einen nicht poetischen Ernst hervorbringt.—Letter 458, *ibid.*, p. 67.

¹The scenes in question would seem to be that in *Auerbachs Keller* (5) and the great last scene, *Kerker* (24). See the *Urfaust*, edited by Schmidt, 1905, pp. 19-31, 83-89.

Surely the truth of these observations is borne out by our own impressions of tragedy as expressed by the masters, notably Shakspeare. The crude data of human suffering and failure, intolerable in themselves, are not merely interpreted and imaginatively beautified, but they are softened, lifted into a diviner air, and universalized by the very fact of rhythmical presentation. On the other hand, as will be considered more particularly a little later, on certain occasions when the rhythm seems to break with the eccentric horror of the emotion, returning to the crude stuff of prose utterance, the impression received is one of pain unrelieved by the usual sense of reconciliation and tragic beauty.

From this point it is hardly a step to the third; indeed the word "universalized" has already been used of the function of rhythm. Prose presents experience in a form too purely individual for tragedy; verse gives the impression of universal law underlying the words of the speaker, and he becomes not merely an idiosyncratic sufferer, but a spokesman for the sorrows of the world. When Lillo chose a Newgate criminal, with no claims to a typical position or to universal sympathy, as the hero of his bourgeois tragedy, he was painfully consistent in choosing prose as the medium of expression. The reader is effectively stirred to pity and terror, but there is no reason why he should be. In this connection we may well look again at the Schiller-Goethe correspondence. In 1797 (November 24), after giving an account of the remarkable way in which a change from prose to verse form lifted the whole tone of his work from the commonplace into the region of imaginative dignity, Schiller added:

Der Rhythmus leistet bei einer dramatischen Production noch dieses grosse und bedeutende, dass er, indem er alle Charaktere und alle Situationen nach Einem Gesetz behandelt, und sie, trotz ihres innern Unterschiedes, in Einer Form ausführt, er dadurch den Dichter und seinen Leser nöthiget, von allem noch so charakteristisch-verschiedenem etwas allgemeines, rein menschliches zu verlangen. Alles soll sich in dem Geschlechtsbegriff des Poetischen vereinigen, und diesem Gesetz dient der Rhythmus sowohl zum Repräsentanten als zum Werkzeug, da er alles inter Seinem Gesetze begreift. Er bildet auf diese Weise die Atmosphäre für die poetische Schöpfung, das gröbere bleibt zurück, nur das geistige

kann von diesem dünnen Elemente getragen werden.—Letter 374, *op. cit.*, I, 329.¹

From all which it appears that that transforming power which in tragedy lays hold of the sufferings or failure of a petty individual spirit, and makes them of significance to the whole race, works normally through the elevating, softening, and universalizing medium of rhythm.

These general conclusions regarding the place of verse in tragedy are not of a character to meet with much opposition. When we pass to comedy, however, the conditions are not quite so clear. The use of prose in comedy has been so long and so firmly established that to question it requires more boldness. But in all that is here said, it will be remembered, reference is had only to *romantic comedy*, not that which portrays life from a descriptive, critical, or satiric standpoint. Our historical study has indicated that it was rather by accident that prose was carried over from the latter type into the former, and that the results were at least questionable.

Briefly, of the three points urged against prose as a medium for tragic expression, the first and third (excluding the argument based on the painfulness of the crude data of tragedy) may be said to hold good for romantic comedy. For in this region also prose is too homely and too individual for the highest purposes of the dramatist.

The inadequacy of prose for the right presentation of the dialogue of romantic comedy should have been made clear by the quotations given in the preceding pages. It is true that they were taken, for the most part, from the work of dramatists of the second rank or under, and that they were written in a period

¹ Goethe replied, giving strong approval to Schiller's observations, and adding: "Alle dramatische Arbeiten sollten rhythmisch sein." It is also interesting to read his condemnation of such hybrid rhythmical prose as we have found in the transition period of the English drama. "Dass man nach und nach poetische Prosa einführen konnte, zeigt nur dass man den Unterschied zwischen Prosa und Poesie gänzlich aus den Augen verlor. Es ist nicht besser als wenn sich jemand in seinem Park einen trockenen See bestellte und der Gartenkünstler diese Aufgabe dadurch aufzulösen suchte dass er einen Sumpf anlegte. Diese Mittelgeschlechter sind nur für Liebhaber und Pfscher, so wie die Sumpfe für Amphibien."—Letter 375, *ibid.*, p. 330. Lessing made use of an equally interesting figure, when he spoke of some prose translations "in welchen der Gebrauch der kühnsten Tropen und Figuren, ausser einer gebundenen cadenzirten Wortfügung, uns an Besessene denken lässt, die ohne Musik tanzen."—*Dramaturgie*, No. 19.

dominated by certain qualities of style which now seem artificial or affected. Later dramatists have done better, no doubt, and would have done still better if the tradition of a really literary comedy had been maintained. Nevertheless the fundamental difficulty with the style of the passages under consideration is inherent in their position. A prose writer, to depict a romantic or imaginative moment in a drama, must do one of two things: he must either attempt to lift it from mere realism to the level which its character seems to call for, or he must try to present it precisely as it might occur in actual experience. The former method, used by most of the eighteenth-century writers whom we have been considering, results in that bad "poetical prose" which attempts to do something for which prose is not fitted. The latter method, which becomes increasingly common as we pass to the later periods, and includes the best work in nineteenth-century comedy, fails as a rule to strike the genuinely romantic note. It raises a smile (as Mr. Archer has lately complained in the case of all the plays of Mr. Bernard Shaw) instead of the eager sigh of the impassioned hearer or reader. Or, if it succeeds in awakening our romantic instincts for the moment, it does so illegitimately, as it were, without the lasting justification of universalized romantic beauty; in other words, it falls under the other objection, that prose is too *individual* a mode of utterance.

It would be difficult and perhaps tedious to support this position by examples. Instead, let appeal be made to the memory of those who have listened repeatedly, in the case of prose comedies, to scenes in which the passion of romantic love is represented. In most cases it will be found that there is present an element of critical or satiric, if not humorous, enjoyment of the scene, instead of the attitude appropriate to true romance. And when it is otherwise, has the auditor not sometimes felt a certain shamefaced sense, at the height of the scene of passion, as of being an intruder—of eavesdropping where he is not concerned, of seeing what is personal and not for the general eye? Why is there no suggestion of such a feeling in the presence of the loves of Romeo and Juliet, or of Ferdinand and Miranda? Because these are lifted above individualism and realism, to the region of universal love and

beauty. And the rhythmical quality of poetry, as we have seen, is largely instrumental in this.

The fact is, we have gone over so largely to comedy of the non-romantic sort that we have lost the charm and forgotten the laws of the other type. The hand of the Restoration is still upon us, separating comedy and poetry, reality and romance. This has never happened to the same degree in the drama of Germany or France, and there are occasional signs that it will not always be so with us.

In conclusion, there remain a few remarks which may be regarded as answers to two possible objections to the foregoing argument. First of all, what of the relation of this doctrine to the novel? If prose is an illegitimate or inadequate form for the presentation of romantic and tragic themes, how has it been so successfully used in tragic novel and prose romance?

To try to answer this fully would take us a long way. But it may be suggested, in the first place, that the novel is to be regarded as a less fixed or perfect form than the drama, and hence as less imperiously demanding the exact adaptation of means to ends. Without going to the length of certain eighteenth-century critics, who held the new form of fiction to be illegitimate because it could not be fitted into any of the traditional literary categories, one may still perceive that, compared with the drama, the novel is a somewhat inaccurate or lawless genre. We should not expect of it, then, the completeness or ideality which the poetic form implies. In the second place, the novel has never so completely justified itself in the regions of romance and tragedy as in those of descriptive and satiric comedy. The chief of its early masters, Fielding, was right in defining it, at its best, as "prose comic epic" in character, and in giving it a prevailingly satiric tone. Of all the novels of the first rank, but few are of the tragic order; and while the great prose romances may be thought to be more numerous (here the critics would quarrel), here also there is a half-hidden feeling that whatever they can do, poetry after all can do better. In the descriptive or satiric novel, on the other hand, there is a freedom, a fidelity to mere fact, an absolution from the necessity of reconciling life with the eternal verities, to which

prose can minister even better than verse. In the third place, the novel does not present human life, and especially human speech, with the same immediate directness as the drama; all is reported through the medium of the writer. Hence there is provided something equivalent to that veil, that softening or distancing element, which we have seen to be needed in the reproduction of the intensest emotional experiences, especially when they are painful; and the verse-form is not so much missed. Fourthly and finally, the novelist presents the most tragic and the most romantic moments of his story not by any means solely through direct dialogue and direct action, as in the drama, but very largely through suggestion. Hence the problem of uplifting and ennobling human speech, ever-present in dramatic dialogue, is here much slighter. Perhaps the two most poignant tragic scenes in the modern English novel are the concluding ones of Meredith's *Richard Feverel* and Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*. In both cases the catastrophe is removed from the actual stage of action; in the one case described, in the other only suggested. Direct human utterance is used as far as it can safely go in realistic form; but when the emotional intensity is highest, it is abandoned for the indirect presentation to the imagination of what lies behind the veil. This hasty outline of certain differences between the possibilities of novel and drama will perhaps help to explain why we are content with prose in the one form when we feel its limitations in the other.

The other possible objection to the views set forth in the foregoing pages is found in an appeal to certain masters of the dramatic form, notably Shakspeare; is it not true—to put it most directly—that, while Shakspeare wrote no tragedy or romantic comedy wholly in prose, he used prose very freely in the more serious plays, and that the proportionate amount of this prose increases as we enter the period of his greatest work? To this one must undoubtedly answer yes. Here again we touch on a matter far too large to be treated adequately at present. The use of prose in the tragedies of Shakspeare is one of the most interesting problems which a student of his workmanship can touch, and whoever should solve the problem, for the play of *Hamlet* alone, would perhaps have reached something like a final state-

ment of the capacities of prose and verse for creative art. All that can now be done is to suggest, as in the question raised by the other objection, why the phenomena under consideration do not militate against the view of verse-form already presented. In the first place, then, the comic and colloquial uses of prose go a good deal farther than what the most familiar use of the terms implies. Hamlet's reflections on the skull in the graveyard scene are by no means comic, but in their brutal presentation of repulsive fact they are as much in contrast with an idealized or poetic treatment of death as the conversation of the grave-diggers themselves. This may give a hint as to why prose is their fitting form. In the same connection Mr. Churton Collins has said that in *Hamlet* prose "becomes the language in which the Prince communes not with himself but with the world" ("Shakespeare as a Prose Writer," *Studies in Shakespeare*, p. 204)—a remark which again may suggest a widened use of the term "colloquial prose."

But passing beyond what can possibly be called colloquial or comic, we find in the plays of Shakspeare's supreme period a considerable amount of prose more difficult to analyze. The cause of it appears to be a matter of intellect, not of emotional expression, and it becomes conspicuous, as by rights it should, in the period when the poet's work was characterized by what one critic has called "the discordant weight of thought" (Mr. D. Laurance Chambers, in *The Metre of Macbeth*). This prose forms no real exception to the general law as to the demand for rhythm wherever the main movement is that of the emotions and the imagination. It may be said to be a kind of precipitate of the predominately intellectual view of life, and disappears again, in large measure, in the later plays where life is once more really solvent in the poetic imagination.

Last of all, there are certain passages in which prose is used under conditions of the profoundest emotional intensity. These are very few, but very significant; allusion has already been made to them. In this case we have gone all the way round the circle, past the point where rhythm veils, idealizes, and reconciles pain, to the point where the pain will not be veiled or reconciled, but will appear in the chaotic intensity of anarchic prose. Such a

moment is that of Lear's impending madness, where it mingles in terrible discord with the assumed madness of Edgar and the quasi-madness of the fool. Or, again, that when Othello breaks into raving before he falls in a cataleptic trance, and that when—a little later—he cries in an abandonment even of the manliness of his grief:

Ay, let her rot, and perish, and be damn'd to-night; for she shall not live. No, my heart is turn'd to stone; I strike it, and it hurts my hand. Passages like these are felt to be intensely painful, in the sense in which Wordsworth said that Shakspeare's tragedies are not, on the whole, painful "beyond the bounds of pleasure;"¹ and we pass over them hurriedly, eager for the recovery of the poetic equilibrium, under which the passion is mastered by the reconciling and restraining power of verse—as, for example, here:

Had it pleas'd Heaven
To try me with affliction; had they rain'd
All kind of sores and shames on my bare head,
Steep'd me in poverty to the very lips,
Given to captivity me and my utmost hopes,
I should have found in some place of my soul
A drop of patience.

This is the language of suffering, but of suffering made more than tolerable—made beautiful. And always we shall find that the conclusion of the tragedy becomes rhythmical, the verse once more growing sweet and regular, as the climax of intensity disappears and the sorrow of the defeated actors fades into a steadily pulsing rhythm that seems to symbolize the underlying imperturbable order of the universe.

RAYMOND MACDONALD ALDEN

LELAND STANFORD JR. UNIVERSITY

APPENDIX

One should not forget an interesting effort made in France to establish the legitimacy of prose for tragedy, by a contemporary of Lillo's, Houdar de la Motte. This charming prose writer and interesting rationalist, though he produced several popular dramas

¹ Compare the *Trüber Tag* scene of *Faust* (22), where Goethe retained the prose form though abandoning it elsewhere.

in verse, professed to do so merely out of deference to public taste, and pleased himself by publishing a prose version of his tragedy of *Œdipe*, side by side with the acted metrical version. He defended the prose form on the fundamental ground of *vraisemblance*. How absurd that a hero, instead of speaking straight out as he would do in real life, should subject all his utterances to the demands of an arbitrary number of syllables and the regular return of the same sounds! "Les passions seront toujours d'autant mieux imitées qu'on leur feroit parler leur vraie langue: or les passions originales n'ont jamais parlé en vers." La Motte added to his theoretical observations, and to his own prose tragedy, a translation of the first scene of Racine's *Mithridate*, in order to exemplify the fact that nothing really valuable is lost by such a proceeding. If any readers do feel a sense of loss, he maintains, the fact will show that they have been in the habit of giving more attention to the verse form than to the more important elements of the tragedy. La Motte, it will be observed, strikes at the very roots of all theoretical justification of the verse drama. The essence of poetry, for him, is "les expressions audacieuses, les figures hyperboliques, tout ce langage reculé de l'usage ordinaire;" and these things, while well enough suited to lyrical writing, are less appropriate to the drama than to oratory; they tempt the poet to a lyricism which usurps the natural utterance of his characters.

To these arguments Voltaire replied in the Preface to his *Œdipe*, but not—it must be admitted—very effectively. It is rhyme rather than verse itself in which he is chiefly interested; and he accepts La Motte's view that the only important charm of metrical form consists in the admiration it arouses for difficulties overcome. The latter replied, in an admirably urbane "Suite des réflexions sur la tragédie," taking the sufficiently liberal ground: "Les tragédies en prose plairoient ou ne plairoient pas. Si elles ne plaisoient pas, . . . qu'aurions-nous perdu? Nous n'en saurions que mieux à quoi nous en tenir; et les vers demeureroient tranquilles dans leur possession. Si elles plaisoient au contraire, n'aurions-nous pas multiplié nos plaisirs?" There follows a pleasant fable of a nation which originally sang all its verse, until an innovator abolished the music in a drama, leaving only

the poetry and the action. Little by little the new method gave pleasure, at length driving out the old. The innovator next proposed to omit the element of verse: "Pourquoi ce reste de musique dans la représentation des choses ordinaires? Puisque vous faites agir des hommes, faites les parler comme des hommes. Vous vous êtes rapprochés de la nature; encore un pas, et vous l'atteindrez." (These various citations are from the *Œuvres de M. Houdar de la Motte*, 1754, I, 555; IV, 391-94, 413, 440-43. See also some remarks of Lanson in his *Histoire de la littérature française*, p. 632.)

Somewhat later Diderot made a similar proposal, in connection with his interest in "domestic tragedy." Thus, in the second of the *Entretiens sur le Fils Naturel*, he refers approvingly to *The London Merchant* and *The Gamester*, and adds: "Les tragédies de Shakspeare sont moitié vers et moitié prose. Le premier poète qui nous fit rire avec de la prose, introduisit la prose dans la comédie. Le premier poète qui nous fera pleurer avec de la prose, introduira la prose dans la tragédie." (*Œuvres de Diderot*, 1821 ed., IV, 163. See also some remarks in the tenth section of the essay *De la Poésie Dramatique*, *ibid.*, p. 477.)

Needless to say, these critics did not prove convincing, even to an age when poetic feeling was quite as much thinned out in France as in England. Dramatic verses remained "tranquilles dans leur possession." But it may be observed that the theory which they set forth might at any time have, a priori, a better chance of finding adherents among their countrymen than in English-speaking lands, since the French language has never differentiated the styles of prose and verse with the same thoroughness as English.

NOTES ON THE FOREIGN ELEMENTS IN RUMANIAN

I. THE NUMERALS

The Rumanian multiples of ten are remade on a model found in all the Slavonic languages: two tens, three tens, four tens, . . . nine tens; likewise the units between ten and twenty: one on ten, two on ten, etc. It is commonly held that these formations are due to combined Albanian and Slavonic influence.¹ It ought to be noted, however, that Albanian does not furnish a complete parallel, since it counts the even tens as scores and has additional units (ten and one, ten and two, ten and three, . . . ten and nine) formed like the higher units in Rumanian and Slavonic.

Latin *centu* has been lost and its place taken by a feminine noun, *sută*;² Meyer-Lübke says, without giving any reason, that this cannot come from the Slavonic *sŭto*.³ It is true that Old Bulgarian *ŭ* generally appears as R. *o* in stressed syllables; but there is at least one other case where it makes *u*, to say nothing of the cases where Latin *ó* becomes *u*.⁴ Thus we have only to explain the final vowel of *sută*, and this can be done in three ways.

Old Slavonic *a* and Latin *a* give R. *a* initially but *ă* medially and finally, in stressless syllables. Old Slavonic *o* gives R. *o* initially but *ă* medially, in stressless syllables.⁵ Hence it is possible that final *ă* from Slavonic *o* was a regular phonetic development, which took place later than the usual change of Latin stressless *o* to R. *u*.

The number *mie*, 1,000, is feminine; so also is *zece*, 10, when used as a noun in its multiples. It would therefore be natural to give the distinct feminine ending *ă* to the only independent numeral between *zece* and *mie*. This logical treatment is found

¹ Tiktin, *Rumänisches Elementarbuch*, §§ 273, 274 (Heidelberg, 1905); Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des langues romanes*, Vol. II, § 559 (Paris, 1895); Jensen, *Die nichtlateinischen bestandteile im rumänischen*, § 3, in Gröber's *Grundriss der romanischen philologie*, Vol. I, 2d ed. (Strassburg, 1906); Gartner, *Darstellung der rumänischen Sprache*, p. 75 (Halle, 1904).

² In Rumanian, as in Slavonic, the cardinals above 19 are not used as adjectives.

³ Meyer-Lübke, *op. cit.*, § 560.

⁴ Tiktin, *op. cit.*, §§ 32, 36.

⁵ Tiktin, *op. cit.*, §§ 52, 74; 63, 76.

in the Rumanian development of several Latin words: *soră* (earlier *sor*) sister, *nepoată* niece, *mână* hand.¹

It seems to be generally supposed that if *sută* is of Slavonic origin, it must come from *sŭto*. Such an assumption is needless; it might well go back to the Old Bulgarian plural, *sŭta*. Because of its ending, this form would necessarily become a feminine word, like Latin *milia*, *folia*, *arma*.

II. THE SUPINE

According to Meyer-Lübke, the Romance tongues have wholly lost the supine.² In Tiktin's opinion, "das lat. supinum ist als solches erhalten."³ The Rumanian verbal noun, corresponding to the Latin supine in form and meaning is explained by Jensen as being due to a similar use of participles in Albanian.⁴ While this parallelism is remarkable, there is another case that seems worth mentioning: Old Bulgarian has an ending *tŭ* that forms the supine and also one of the past participles.⁵ We may suppose that through Slavonic influence, a new supine was created or the old one was kept from disappearing. Either supposition is less far-fetched than the theory that the Rumanian supine, ending in *-t* or *-s*, originated in an Albanian form ending in *-ne* (later *-re*). It is clear that after the Slavonic supine had produced a Rumanian one in *-t* like the ordinary participle, the few irregular *s*-participles would by analogy take on the same double function.

III. PALATALIZATION

Palatalized *c* and *t* generally become affricate sound-groups (*tš* or *ts*);⁶ but after *s* they appear as *t* when the following vowel remains palatal in Rumanian. Meyer-Lübke says that *sk* developed to *štš* and then to *št* by assimilation;⁷ this seems to be

¹ Tiktin, *op. cit.*, §174.

² Tiktin, *op. cit.*, §263.

³ Meyer-Lübke, *op. cit.*, §111.

⁴ Jensen, *op. cit.*, §3.

⁵ Leskien, *Handbuch der althbulgarischen Sprache*, §§99, 102 (3d ed., Weimar, 1898). Perhaps the infinitive ending *-ti* helped in the Rumanian development.

⁶ Rousselot's theory that such affricates are simple sounds (*Principes de phonétique expérimentale*, pp. 532-533 [Paris, 1901]) is disproved by his own records; see *Die neueren Sprachen*, Vol. XI, p. 327 (Oktober, 1903).

⁷ *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, §473 (Paris, 1890). Meyer-Lübke uses phonetic spelling, ordinary orthography and mixtures of the two without distinction, so that, for example, the Rumanian derivative of Latin *lepore* appears as three different words in the index (*epure*, *iepure*, and *jepure*), though they all mean exactly the same thing phonetically. I use italics for ordinary spelling alone.

a mistake for "dissimilation," which is the term he applies to cases like *f(1)aible* and *prop(r)io*.¹ Or he may have intended "assimilation" for the first part of the process, *stš* to *štš*. After illustrating the change of *st* to *št*, the same writer refers for explanation to a preceding paragraph where nothing is said about the matter.²

The fact is that Rumanian has followed Slavonic habits of palatalization here, just as it has in the weakening of *tš* to *š* before a consonant, and in the strengthening of palatal vowels at the beginning of syllables.³ The change of *sk*, before any original palatal vowel,⁴ through *štš* to *št*, and likewise that of palatalized *st* to *št*, are regular developments in Bulgarian⁵ and Servian.⁶ As these two languages furnished most of the Slavonic loan-words in Rumanian, we cannot reasonably doubt their influence on its morphology and phonology.

E. H. TUTTLE

YALE UNIVERSITY

¹ *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, § 589.

² *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, § 469. The reference can hardly be misprinted, as it is given again in § 489.

³ Tiktin, *op. cit.*, §§ 131, 50; Jensen, *op. cit.*, § 4; Gartner, *op. cit.*, § 9.

⁴ Not merely before *j* as Jensen says, § 4. Slavonic *j* (written *j* in Servian and the western alphabets) sounds like the Italian consonantal *i* or *j* in *teri*, *jeri*.

⁵ Leskien, *op. cit.*, § 31; secondary *š*, *i*, from *ai*, *oi*, change *sk* to *st*.

⁶ Novaković, *Srpska gramatika*, drugo celokupno izdanje, § 94 (u Beogradu, 1902).

THE SOURCES OF OLIVIER DE MAGNY'S SONNETS

Of the poets, outside the actual *Pléiade*, who gathered round Ronsard and Du Bellay, the most attractive figure, at any rate of those who confined themselves to non-dramatic poetry, is undoubtedly that of Olivier de Magny, born at Cahors about 1530. His lively temperament and pleasant disposition made him a favorite among his contemporaries; his romantic relations with Louise Labé, *la belle cordière de Lyon*, his untimely death, and, it must be said, the intrinsic value of part of his work, have enabled him to maintain his place, modest as it is, by the side of the brighter constellation of the *Pléiade*, since the day that Sainte-Beuve revived the study of French sixteenth-century literature. His inborn talent, which was considerable, would have made it possible for him to occupy a more exalted position in the poetic firmament if he had followed his natural bent, instead of systematically resorting to Italian models.

It is our intention in the present paper to show how great was his indebtedness to Italian models, as far as the *Sonnets* are concerned.¹ That he lacked originality has been suspected or assumed, and in a few cases actually proved, but although Olivier de Magny's works have been republished and annotated² twice within recent times, and made the subject of a voluminous thesis for the Paris doctorate,³ the question has never been thoroughly investigated. Such investigations may not have very great importance in themselves, but when looked at in the broader light of comparative literature they assume a different and more significant aspect. Not until the chief French writers of the sixteenth century have been subjected to a similar process will it be possible to

¹ While the present paper (written in the summer of 1908) has been waiting for the press in America, I have been anticipated in a few of my results by J. Vianey in *Le Pétrarquisme en France au XVI^e siècle* (Montpellier-Paris), which appeared in the early months of the present year.

² By P. Blanchemain, 1869-76, and by E. Courbet, 1871-80.

³ Jules Favre, *Olivier de Magny: Étude biographique et littéraire*. Thèse présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris, Paris, 1885.

estimate with any finality the debt of French literature in that period to the sister literature across the Alps, and to solve a problem of comparative literature of the greatest interest and importance. That the influence of Italian letters—discernible already in the work of the *Rhétoriciens* of the Burgundian school, transformed and reinforced by Marot and Saint-Gelais, and later by Ronsard and his associates—was far-reaching and permeating during this epoch is known, thanks to the labors of scholars such as Flamini, Toldo, Lemerrier, and especially J. Vianey of Montpellier.¹ Much has been done in the course of the last twenty years or so, but much remains to be done. It is for these reasons that I have ventured to present this small contribution to a large and important subject.

The first sonnet-collection of Olivier de Magny appeared in 1553, under the title *Amours*. It consisted of 102 sonnets and some dozen odes addressed to an ideal mistress, a noble lady of the neighborhood of Cahors, the poet's native town.

With regard to the sources of *Amours*, Professor Francesco Torraca, in his learned study on *Gl'imitatori stranieri di Jacopo Sannazaro* (Rome, 1882), has proved that ten of these sonnets are filched from Sannazaro, but naturally he does not consider Olivier de Magny beyond the precincts of the particular topic he had set himself. Favre (*op. cit.*, p. 156) simply says in a general way that Olivier de Magny was "inspired" by Petrarch, without quoting any instances in support of his statement. This inspiration, however, took a very definite form, as we shall see presently. At least eleven of the sonnets of *Amours* can be shown to have been appropriated, either wholly or in part, from the author of the *Rime*. In some cases the imitation degenerates into mere translation, as in Sonnet XXXI, which reproduces servilely Sonnet CLXIX (No. 224) of the great Italian master:²

¹ For the bibliography of the subject compare pp. 175-91 of Louis-P. Betz' *La littérature comparée. Essai bibliographique. Deuxième édition augmentée*, par Fernand Baldensperger, Strasbourg, 1904. A supplement to Betz-Baldensperger was published in *Modern Language Notes*, XX (1905), 235-39, by C. S. Northup. Reference should also be made to various articles in the *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, *Revue de la renaissance*, *Bulletin italien*—to mention only the more important periodicals.

² Petrarch is quoted according to the convenient little edition published by G. Barbera of Florence, and Olivier de Magny according to Courbet's text.

Si vn vray cuer, vne foy amoureuse,
Vne langueur d'honorable desir,
Vn long erreur, lequel on peult choisir
Au labyrinth d'vne tristesse heureuse.

Avoir au front la peine doloieuse
Protraite au vif, & se voir dessaisir
De sa couleur & de tout son plaisir,
Par la rigueur d'vne mort doucereuse.

Avoir autrui plus que soy-mesme cher,
Brusler de loing, glaçant à l'aprocher,
Ayant tousiours deux ruisseaux au visage,
Bref si le soing, & le trahistre tour-
mant

M'afflige ainsi (ma Dame) en vous aymant,
La coulpe est vostre, & mien est le dommage.

S'una fede amorosa, un cor non finto,
Un languir dolce, un desiar cortese;
S'oneste voglie in gentil foco accese;
S'un lungo error in cieco laberinto;

Se ne la fronte ogni penser dipinto,
Od in voci interrotte appena intese,
Or da paura, or da vergogna offese;
S'un pallor di viola e d'amor tinto;

S'aver altrui più caro che se stesso;
Se lagrimar e sospirar mai sempre,
Pascendosi di duol, d'ira e d'affanno;
S'arder da lunge ed agghiacciare da
presso,

Son le cagion ch'amando i'mi distempre,
Vostro, donna, il peccato, e mio fia'l danno.

In other instances Olivier de Magny follows his original almost as closely, though allowing himself a few variations in the phraseology, as in Sonnet XXIII (= *Canz.*, No. 12):

Si le puis tant me deffendre au tourment,
Et au trauail qui me ronge & chagrine,
Qu'à l'auenir vostre beauté diuine
Je puisse voir changer d'acoustrement,
Ces tresses d'or aussi leur ornement
En fin argent, ceste face benigne
Perdre son teinct, & d'vne merque & signe
De grauité se peindre seulement:

Amour alors me donra tant d'audace,
Que hardiment, & deuant vostre face
Je conteray mes ennuyx endurez.

Et vous helas! voyant ma foy constante,
Et l'aspreté de ma peine euidente,
De mes trauaux me recompenserez.

Se la mia vita da l'aspro tormento
Si può tanto schermire e dagli affanni,
Ch'io veggia, per virtù degli ultimi anni,
Donna, de' be' vostri occhi il lume spento,

E i cape' d'oro fin farsi d'argento,
E lassar le ghirlande e i verdi panni,
E'l viso scolorir che ne' miei danni
A lamentar mi fa pauroso e lento;

Pur mi darà tanta baldanza Amore,
Ch'io vi discovrirò, de' miei martiri
Qua' sono stati gli anni e i giorni e l'ore.

E se'l tempo è contrario ai be' desiri,
Non sia ch' almen non giungal mio dolore
Alcun soccorso di tardi sospiri.

Or again in the penultimate sonnet of the collection (= *Canz.*, No. 132):

Si d'Amour vient mon gracieux martyre,
L'effet d'Amour, las quoy! quelle chose
est-ce?

Si bonne elle est, les siens comment oppresse,
Pourquoy à mal incessamment les tire?

Si mauuaise est, quell' raison ay ie à dire
Doux mon tourment, plaisante ma tristesse?
Si elle plaist, à quoy plain-je sans cesse?
S'elle deplaist, que m'y vault dueil ou ire?

O viuë mort! o mal plaisant à voir!
Comme avez vous sur moy tant de pouuoir,
Puis que voz loix ma volonté n'approuue?

O feux iumeaux! o trompeuse esper-
ance!

Vous seulz causez en moy tant d'inconstance,
Qu'en bien ou mal, content ie ne me trouue.

S'amor non è, che dunque è quel ch' i'
sento?

Ma s'egli è amor, per Dio, che cosa è quale?
Se buona, ond' è l'effetto aspro mortale?
Se ria, ond' è sì dolce ogni tormento?

S' a mia voglia ardo, ond' è'l pianto e'l
lamento

S' a mal mio grado, il lamentar che vale?
O viva morte, o diletto male,
Come puoi tanto in me s'io nol consento?

E s'io'l consento, a gran torto mi doglio.
Fra sì contrari venti, in frale barca
Mi trovo in alto mar, senza governo,

S' iue di saver, d'error sì carica,
Ch'io medesimo non so quel ch'io mi voglio,
E tremo a mezza state, ardendo il verno.

Further examples are Sonnets X, XLI, LI, LXI, LXXXVI, XC, which may be compared to Sonnets XC, CXC, CXLIII,

CXLVI, CXXXIV, LXXXIV of Petrarch's *Rime*; Sonnet XX, which is an amplification of the seventh sestina ("Non ha tanti animali il mar fra l' onde"), and Sonnet LXIII, which is formed on the pattern of Canzone XV ("S' i'l dissi mai, ch' i' venga in odio a quella"). More interesting, perhaps, because less obvious, are the loans which the author of *Amours* levied on the poets of the school of Bembo, or Venetian Petrarchists as they are sometimes styled, who were then coming into prominence and several of whom were contemporaries of the French poet. Great as was their vogue, it had been considerably enhanced by the recent publication of an anthology of their lyrical work with an introduction by Lodovico Domenichi, a friend of the Cardinal's and a not undistinguished member of the group. The first volume of this important selection¹ was issued at Venice in 1545 by the well-known publisher Gabriel Giolito under the title *Rime diverse di molti eccellentiss. autori nuovamente raccolte, Libro primo*. It very quickly ran into three editions. Here was a convenient and abundant garner containing the best grain of Italian contemporary poetry which the French poets could pillage at their ease without being immediately detected even by the initiated. M. Vianey, in his admirable essay on the sources of Du Bellay's *L'Olive*,² has shown with what prodigality Ronsard's lieutenant drew on that supply. It is not improbable that Olivier de Magny had his attention drawn more expressly to this precious anthology by his friend Du Bellay, although the latter had already publicly, if somewhat cryptically, published his appreciation of it in his literary manifesto—"pour le sonnet donques tu as Petrarque et quelques modernes Italiens."³ However that may be, Olivier de Magny was not slow to follow the example of his predecessor, in the composition of his first sonnet-sequence. He was, indeed, somewhat more discreet; but nevertheless he showed his appreciation of this new publication in no uncertain manner. The

¹ The second edition appeared in 1546, and the third in 1549. A second volume was issued in 1547, and further additions were made to the collection till the year 1556.

² *Les sources italiennes de l'Olive*, in the "Annales internationales d'histoire" (Congrès de Paris, 1900), Paris, 1901, pp. 73 ff.

³ Du Bellay had also written in the preface to the first edition of *L'Olive*: "vrayment je confesse avoir imité Petrarque, et non luy seulement, mais aussi l'Arioste et d'autres modernes Italiens."

ninth sonnet of *Amours*, which Favre, quite innocent of its source, admires for its originality and for its "freshness" and "Virgilian grace" (*op. cit.*, p. 157), is picked from the bunch of sonnets contributed to Giolito's anthology (I, 279) by Bernardino Tomitano of Padua, and reproduced with startling literalness:

Comme au printemps la Pastourelle gaye,
A qui le froid de l'hiver ia passé,
Auoit d'ennuis grand nombre pourchassé
Et de langueur faict mainte amere playe:

Maintenant va, puis santelle, & s'essaye
Parmy les champs d'un desir insensé,
Rendre du tout son cuer recompensé
Par la verdure de ce temps qui l'esgaye:

Mais il auient qu'elle foule en sautant
Un froid Serpent dessous l'herbette estant
Si qu'il la mord, dont apres ell' trespasse.

Ainsi m'auient quand de voz doux propos
Me prometiez allegence & repos,
Blessant mon cuer du trait de vostre grace.

Si come all' hor, che lieta primavera
Tornando a noi rimena i fiori & l'erba;
Et Frogne, che sfogar suoi danni spera,
Con dolci note a lagrimar si serba:

La pastorella, a cui dannosa, & fiera
Stagion poco anzi fe la vita acerba
Di piaggia in piaggia va destra, & leggiera;
Hor che'l suo danno in tutto disacerba;

Tanto che mal accorta preme poi
Freddo serpente, che tra l'erba giace;
Oud' ella offesa a poco a poco more.

Tal fu donna di me quel di, che voi
Sotto lusinghe di tranquilla pace
Di mortal piaga mi feriste il core.

The same remark applies to Sonnet XVIII, except that this time it is Tomaso Castellani (Giolito, I, 50) who supplies the model:

Souz autre Ciel, par eau plus fauorable,
Me fault voguer, ou me retraire à riue,
Puis que ma nef que la Fortune priue
De vent prospere est ainsi miserable.

Si douce ouys la chanson agreable
D'une Sirene en forme humaine & viue,
Que m'oublant en douceur si natue,
Le vis ma barque en danger incroyable.

Face le Ciel qu'estoile plus benigne
L'errant espoir des maintenant destine
Au port heureux, au haure plus licite:

Et ce grand Dieu, donneur de tant de
graces,

Par autre mer, par de meilleures trasses
Conduyse à port ma nasselle petite.

Homai eott' altro ciel per miglior acque
Correr conuiemmi, over ritrar a riva:

Poi che mia nave di buon vento priva
Sempre in quest' onde a la fortuna spiacque:

Si dolce canto a le mie orecchie piacque
D'una Sirena in forma humana, & viva;
Che mentre errando troppo m'aggradiva
Il legno mio quasi sommerso giacque;

Hor faccia il ciel, che piu benigna stella
L'errante mia speranza homai destine
Al porto ver, per via piu dritta & bella;

Et quel gran donator de le divine
Gratie: la mia smarrita navicella

Per altro mar conduca a miglior fine.

In Sonnet LXXXIV, Guiseppe Betussi (Giolito, I, 354), another of Bembo's disciples, is laid under contribution by the French poet in much the same manner:

Haste le train de tes coursiers ardans,
O cler Phobus, & en l'Ocean entre,
Esclarcissant l'obscur du profond centre
Et de Thetis le sein jusqu'au dedans.

Car ton flambeau aux humains regar-
dants,

Pleasant en tout, me consume en cest antre,
Et je ne quiers que l'ombre & la nuit, entre
Tant de desirs dans mon cuer residans.

Affretta i tuoi corsier piu de l'usato
Phobo, & ne l'Oceano entra veloce;

E a Theti, che d'amor t'incende, e cuoce
Riedi nel grembo di splendor ornato:

Però che il tuo bel lume al mondo
grato

Fuor ch'a me sol, si mi consuma, & nuoce;
Che co'l desio, co'l cor, & con la voce

Bramo vedermi intorno horror turbato:

Non que ce soit que mon cuer & mes
yeux
L'obecurité de la nuit ayment mienx
Que de ce iour la clarté reluyante.
Mais pour autant que l'espere gagner,
Des que le iour ie verray s'esloigner,
Quelque guerdon de ma peine cuysante.

Non già però, che di costume antico
Le tenebre più grate a gli occhi miei
Siano, & il lume capital nemico;
Ma perche lunga notte esser vorrei
Questa, in che il ciel a me cotanto amico
Mi rendera quel ben, ch'io già perdel.

In Sonnet XLIV, modeled on one of Battista della Torre (Giolito, I, 103), the rendering is perhaps not quite so close, though literal enough, to be sure:

Voisine Echo qui m'ois en lamentant,
Or' dans le creux d'un humide rocher,
Or' dans un boys obscur à l'aprocher,
Ayes pitié de mon deuil augmentant.
Si ie me plains mon Esprit tormentant,
Et de mes pleurs ie m'efforce estancher
L'ardante soif qui tant me vient facher,
Le fier destin de mon cuer desmentant,
I'oy à l'instant ta voix si pitoyable,
Qui correspond à mon mal incroyable,
Criant, tremblant, souspirant apres moy,
Te souvenant (peult estre) & ie le pense,
Du tour ingrat, & froide recompense,
De ton amy, l'amoureux vain de soy.

Vicina Echo. ch' ascolti i miei lamenti;
Et quantunque fra sassi & tra le frondi
Occultamente a gli occhi miei t'ascondi,
Mostri pietà de miei gravi tormenti.
Tu raddoppi i miei tristi ultimi accenti
Tu col mio spesso il tuo dolor confondi:
S'io grido Farnia; & tu Farnia rispondi;
Et meco, s'io mi doglio, ti lamenti.
Te sola ho provato io nimpha pietosa,
Come quella, cui forse anchor soviene
De l'amato Narciso la durezza.
Egual arde ambidue fiamma amorosa:
Egual è'l nostro amor, pari le pene;
Et ambidue già vinse egual bellezza.

It is interesting to note, by the way, that this same sonnet of Della Torre was also imitated by Du Bellay in the twenty-fourth sonnet of his *Olive*. However, this did not deter Olivier de Magny from writing a version which on the whole is superior to that of his predecessor.

Other parallels are Sonnets LXXII and XCI, which may be confronted with similar compositions, in Giolito's selection, by Lodovico Corfini (I, 96) and Luigi Tansillo (V, 23) respectively.

Occasionally the imitation is freer and confined to the quatrains as in Sonnet XIX, based on the following sonnet of Anton Giacomo Corso (Giolito, II, 178):

L'Architecteur du grand Palais des
Cieux,
Voulant remplir de merueille le monde,
Orna ce corps d'une perruque blonde,
Qui le soleil rend trouble & soucieux:
Puis d'une flamme éclairante en ces yeux,
L'alme soustien ou mon erreur ie fonde,
Puis d'un Esprit, enrichi de faconde,
Et du tresor le plus prisé des Dieux, etc.

Volse il sommo Architetto al gran lauoro
Quando ne l'alta sua divina Idea
Il tutto fece in quest' alma mia Dea
Ogni pregio donar gratia, e decoro,
Perche il valor, per cui nel primo choro
Ogni spiro è felice, in lei vedea
Render il Mondo, e più la bella Astrea
Chiari, e mostrar più aperto il suo thesoro,
etc.

Similarly the opening lines of Sonnet XXVII recall a sonnet of Giacomo Sellaio (Giolito, IV, 30).

The above instances appear to exhaust the series of sonnets in *Amours* filched from specific Italian prototypes. It must not be thought, however, that the rest show much greater originality and spontaneity. If they are not transplanted bodily they are unmistakably confected from pieces and patches gathered in Petrarch's *Rime* and those of his long line of descendants in the sixteenth century. It would be wearisome and serve no very useful purpose to strengthen a case, already sufficiently convincing, by accumulating these scattered fragments.

Early in 1555 Olivier de Magny went to Rome as secretary to Jean d'Avanson who was charged with a special mission to the Pope. He was home again the following year, and in 1557 he issued a new volume, consisting this time exclusively of sonnets, under the title of *Les soupirs*. Written at Rome at the time when Du Bellay was inditing his *Regrets*, which it recalls in form and substance, this new effort marks a distinct advance on Olivier de Magny's previous poetic attempts; it might almost challenge comparison with Du Bellay's more famous work if the author did not here again give way to his piratical proclivities. He warns us, it is true, in the sixth sonnet, that his themes are not new—"ce sont tous arguments fort communs à nostre âge"—but even this admission hardly leads us to expect the wholesale and indiscriminate plagiarisms to which he descends in this more mature performance.

In looking for originals the writer to whose works we shall again first turn will of course be Petrarch, and in this instance also the harvest is a rich one. Favre in a feeble chapter on *Les Soupirs* (*op. cit.*, pp. 227-63), by referring some half-dozen sonnets of that series to Petrarch—he does not say a word concerning the other Italian sonneteers—has given quite a false impression of the French poet's originality, or rather the lack of it. Not six, but at least fifteen, of the sonnets of Olivier de Magny's second collection are translated or adapted wholly or in part from the master. Only those not already quoted by Favre and which imitate closely the Italian original will be considered in detail.

Sonnet LXV is an almost verbatim translation of Sonnet LXX of the *Rime* (No. 102):

Eme, quand Tolomée eust enuoié la teste
De Pompée à Cesar, Cesar pour courir
mieux
L'aise qu'il en sentoit, fit soudain deses yeux
Escouler mille pleurs, & n'en feit autre feste.
Quand Hannibal aussi veit finir sa con-
queste,
Et veit perir son heur, seize ans victorieux,
Encor que le destin luy fust trop ennuieux,
Il couroit son despit d'un rire bien honneste.
Ainsi l'homme prudent coure sa passion
Sous un manteau à son affliction,
Et fait tousiours semblant d'estre content &
libre:
Partant si quelque fois tu m'ois rire ou
chanter,
Ne pense que ce soit pour me sentir deliure,
C'est pour courir le mal qui me vient tour-
menter.

Cesare, poi che'l traditor d'Egitto
Li fece il don de l'onorata testa,
Celandò l'allegrezza manifesta,
Pianse per gli occhi fuor, sì come è scritto;
Ed Annibal, quando a l'imperio afflittò
Vide farsi fortuna sì molesta,
Rise fra gente lagrimosa e mesta,
Per isfogare il suo acerbo despetto:
E così avvèn che l'animo ciascuna
Sua passion sotto 'l contrario manto
Ricopre con la vista or chiara or bruna.
Però, s'alcuna volta i' rido o canto,
Facciòl perch' i' non ò se non quest'una
Via da celare il mio angoscioso pianto.

The phraseology and turns of Sonnet LXXXIX of Petrarch
(*Canz.*, No. 133) are rendered with still greater servility in Sonnet
XCVI:

Comme un blanc à sagette Amour a fait
mon ame,
Comme neige au soleil, & comme cire au feu,
Et comme nué au vent, mais il t'en chaut
bien peu,
Et m'aides tousiours moins quand plus ie te
reclame,
De ton oeil brunissant sort le coup qui
m'entame,
Contre qui ne me vault hélas! ny tens ny lieu,
De toi seule procede, & non du petit Dieu,
Le Soleil, & le feu, & le vent qui m'espame.
Mon penser amoureux est le trait si cui-
sant,
Ton visage divin le Soleil si luisant,
Et mon desir ardent la flamme poursuiuy,
De quoy amour me poingt, m'aueugle, &
me destruit,
Et ta voix est le vent au deuant de qui fuyt
Trop vistement hélas! ma miserable vie.

Amor m'ha posto come segno a strale,
Come al Sol neve, come cera al foco,
E come nebbia al vento; e son già roco,
Donna, mercè chiamando; e voi non cale.
Dagli occhi vostri uscìo 'l colpo mortale,
Contra cui non mi val tempo nè loco;
Da voi sola procede (e parvi un gioco)
Il sole e'l foco e'l vento, ond' io son tale.
I pensier son saette, e 'l viso un sole,
E'l desir foco; e insieme con quest' arme
Mi punge Amor, m'abbaglia, e mi distrugge;
E l'angelico canto e le parole,
Col dolce spirto ond'io non posso aitar me,
Son l'aura innanzi a cui mia vita fugge.

Favre (*op. cit.*, p. 254) commits the imprudence of placing
Sonnet XCVIII under the rubric "Les sonnets originaux;" it
is obviously a translation of the penultimate sonnet of the first
part of the *Rime* (No. 265, of which, by the way, Desportes, *Les
Amours d'Hippolyte*, No. XLVI, also gave a translation):

Aspre cueur, & sauuaige, & fiere volenté,
En tant douce, & tant humble, angelique
figure,
Si vos grandes rigueurs plus longuement l'en-
dure,

Aspro core e selvaggio, e cruda voglia
In dolce, umile, angelica figura,
Se l'impresso rigor gran tempo dura,

Vous aurez peu d'honneur de m'auoir sur-
monté.
Soit l'autonne, ou l'yuer, le printens, ou
l'esté,
Ou soit-il iour luisant, ou soit-il nuit ob-
scure,
Ie me plains en tout tens de ma rude avan-
ture,
De Madame & d'Amour sans cesse tourmenté.
L'Espoir seul me fait viure, & me fait
souvenir,
Que j'ay veu maintes fois par espreue
aduenir,
Que l'eau par trait de tens les grans mar-
bres entame:
Et qu'il n'est point de cueur si dur ne
si cruel,
Qu'on ne puisse amollir d'un pleur con-
tinuél,
Ny de si froid vouloir qui parfois ne s'en-
flame.

In Sonnet CXIII Petrarch is followed with almost equal
literalness (= *Canz.* No. 163):

Amovr, qui vois tout seul dans mon pen-
ser ouuert,
Et comme en te suyuant nuit & jour ie
tracasse,
Allege un peu mon cueur du tourment qui
l'enbrasse,
Mon coeur à toy cogneu, à tout autre cou-
uert.
Tu sçais pour te suiur l'ennuy que l'ay
souffert,
Tu vois ma pacience & ma foy qui se lasse,
Et tu ne veux pourtant que l'esloigne ta
trasse,
Ainçois me fais tousiours te suiure en ce
desert.
L'aperçoy bien de loing le feu dont tu
m'alumes,
Mais ie n'ay comme toy pour y voler des
plumes,
Et fault que l'aïlle ainsi sans espoir de con-
fort.
Mourray-ie donc? ouy. Mourons donc à
cette heure,
Il ne m'en chault, pourveu qu'en bien aimant
ie meure,
Et pourveu que Madame ayt plaisir en ma
mort.

Avran di me poco onorata spoglia:
Chè quando nasce e mor fior, erba e
foglia
Quando è'l di chiaro e quando è notte
oscura,
Piango ad ogni or. Ben ò di mia ventura,
Di Madonna e d'Amore onde mi doglia.
Vivo sol di Speranza, rimembrando
Che poco umor già per continua prova
Consumar vidi marmi e pietre salde.
Non è sì duro cor che lagrimando,
Pregando, amando, talor non si mova;
Nè sì freddo voler che non si scalde.

Amor, che vedi ogni pensiero aperto
E i duri passi onde tu sol mi scorgi,
Nel fondo del mio cor gli occhi tuoi porgi,
A te palese, a tutt' altri coverto.
Sai quel che per seguirti ho già sofferto;
E tu pur via di poggio in poggio sorgi
Di giorno in giorno, e di me non t'accorgi
Che son sì stanco e'l sentier m'è troppo erto.
Ben vegg'io di lontano il dolce lume
Ove per aspre vie mi sproni e giri;
Ma non ò, come tu, da volar piume.
Assai contenti lasci i miei desiri,
Pur che ben destando i'mi consume,
Nè le dispiaccia che per lei sospiri.

Sonnets X, XXXVII, CXVII are either adaptations or free
renderings of Sonnets CXXVI, LXXVI, CXC, while Sonnets VII
and LXXXIX are partly imitated either from the quatrains or
tercets of Sonnets XCIX and LXXXIX. Lastly, Sonnet LX is
based on Canzone XV.

Petrarch, however, was not the only Italian poet who furnished models. Professor Torraca should have noted that Olivier de Magny's imitation of Sannazaro's sonnets is not confined to *Amours*, and that at least three of the sonnets of *Les Soupirs* are taken from those of the author of *Arcadia*.

Sonnet XI may be fairly described as a translation pure and simple:

O monde malheureux, o desir vain &
fresle,
O terre, o ciel, o dieux auzes à mon bien,
O vie qui ne peult dissouldre ce lyen
Bien que je te cognoisse & petite & mortelle,
O miserable sort, o fortune cruelle,
Qui mes dolents ennuy n'estimas iamais
rien,
O Parque sans pitié, o Nocher stygien
Que ne m'ameines tu l'infernale nasselle!
Puis qu'on ne veult ici mon tourment
secourir,
Puisse-le au moins bien tost miserable
mourir.
Pour euitier le mal dont mon ame est at-
taincte.
Bien heureux soit le jour auquel la fiere
mort
M'enuoira de son dard passer la bas le port,
Puis que par tant de mal du danger ie n'ay
crainte.

O Mondo; o sperar mio caduco e frale;
O ciel sempre al mio ben tenace e parco,
O vita, onde d'uscir non trovo il varco,
E veggio che pur sei breve e mortale;
O fati; o ria fortuna a cui non cale
Di questo mio noioso e grave incarco;
O faretra spietata; o crudel'arco;
Perchè tarda ver me l'ultimo strale?
Ch'almen questa bramosa e calda voglia
Giungendo al fin del sestodecim' anno
Si spenga, e tragga il cor di tanta doglia.
Benedetto quel dì, che'l duro affanno
Caccierà fuor de la terrena spoglia
L'anima che per duol non teme il danno.

Similarly Sonnet LXVI, much in the same vein, is again a verbatim reproduction:

Inutile desir, interdette esperance,
Cauteleuse pensée & vouloir auenglé,
Larmes, plainctes, souspirs & tourment
dereiglé,
Donnez ou paix ou tresue à ma longue eouf-
france.
Et s'au mal le dedain ny l'oubly n'a
puissance,
Et que je doive ainsi sans fin estre comblé
De tant & tant d'ennuy dans mon ame as-
semblé,
Face la mort sur moy sa dure violence:
Ou le ciel promptement me foudroie le
cher,
Car ie n'ay point de peur de nul mortel me-
schef,
Pourveu qu'en trespassant ma peine ne me
suive.
Sus donc Amour, va-t'en, retire toy, a dieu,
Ta force en mon endroit demeure ores oisive,
Pais que nouvelle playe en moy n'a plus de
lieu.

Interdette speranze, e van desio,
Pensier' fallaci, ingorde e cieche voglie,
Lagrima triste, e voi sospiri e doglie,
Date omai pace al lasso viver mio.
E s'al mio mal non val forza d'obblío,
Nè per disdegno il nodo si discioglie;
Prenda morte di me l'ultime spoglie,
Pur ch'abbia fin mio fato acerbo e rio.
Usin le stelle e'l ciel tutte lor prove;
Ch'a quel ch'io sento mi parranno un gioco:
Da sì profonda parte il duol si move.
Gitta, Amor, l'arco, le saette e'l foco:
Drizza il tuo ingegno e le tue forze altrove:
Che nuova piaga in me non ha più loco.

Favre (*op. cit.*, p. 254) classes Sonnet XCVII among the original sonnets. He ought to have said that it was also translated from Sannazaro:

Cil escriue de toy qui d'un oeillet vermeil,
Pense fleurir l'odeur aux poignantes orties,
Voir des astres du ciel les flammes amorties,
Et veoir en Occident l'Aurore & le Soleil.

Celuy face de toy un oeuvre nompereil,
Qui se veult voir à droit tenaillé des envies,
Et qui veult en mourant voir deux noms &
deux vies,

S'endormir tout au coup d'un eternal sommeil.

Cil escriue de toy qui veult perdre sa peine,

Qui ne beut onc de l'eau de la docte fontaine,
Ny mascha du laurier sur le double coupeau.

Cil escriue de toy sur le vent, ou sur l'onde,

Qui veult semer ton nom vainement par le monde,

Et veoir son nom & luy sous un mesme tombeau.

Scriva di te chi far gigli e viole
Del seme spera di pungenti ortiche,
Le stelle al ciel veder tutte nemiche,
E con l'aurora in Occidente il sole.

Scriva chi fama al mondo aver non vuole;
A cui non fur già mai le muse amiche;
Scriva chi perder vuol le sue fatiche,
Lo stil l'ingegno il tempo e le parole.

Scriva chi bocca in lauro mai non colase;
Chi mai non giunse a quella rupe estrema,
Nè verde fronda a le sue tempie avvolse.

Scriva in vento ed in acqua il suo poema
La mar che mai per te la penna tolse;
E caggia il nome, e poca terra il prema.

The above cases of imitation in *Les Soupîrs*, in conjunction with those already instanced by Torraca from *Amours*, are of special interest; Olivier de Magny and Baif were the only members of Ronsard's school who systematically ransacked Sannazaro's sonnets for models.¹ The other members of the group preferred his Latin works and more especially the marine eclogues to which Du Bellay had pointed in the *Défense*.

Olivier de Magny also differed from his associates in his cultivation and imitation of those Italian poets who flourished at the very end of the fifteenth and at the beginning of the sixteenth century, and who are known as the *Quattrocento*²—Cariteo, Tebaldeo, Serafino of Aquila, and the rest. The quattrocentists exercised considerable influence in France till the advent of the *Pléiade*; as early as 1511 Jean Lemaire de Belges, in the *Concorde des deux langages*, had placed Serafino on an equal footing with Dante and Petrarch, and his *strambotti* as well as those of Tebaldeo had afforded material for more than one dizain of Saint-

¹ At a later date, Desportes, who copied anything Italian that came his way, also utilized Sannazaro's sonnets.

² For details on the *Quattrocento* reference should be made to A. d'Ancona, "Del secentismo nella poesia cortigiana del secolo XV," in *Studi sulla letteratura italiana de' primi secoli* (Ancona, 1884), and to Philippe Monnier, *Le Quattrocento* (Paris, 1901).

Gelais and of Maurice Scève, in spite of, or rather because of, their extravagant conceits and far-fetched hyperboles. The example of Du Bellay, who sought his models in the Venetian Petrarchists and in Ariosto, turned the French sonnet away from this channel, till the manner of Tebaldeo and his admirers was revived, toward the latter end of the century, by Desportes in his numerous sonnet-sequences.

From Antonio Tebaldeo of Ferrara, looked upon as a master by his disciples, Olivier de Magny took Sonnet LVIII, which renders the Italian original with great literalness:

Rosignollet ioly, qui dedans la maison
Chantes de ma Maistresse, en vne estroite
caige,
Naguere tu soulois, libre par le bouscaige,
Annoncer de ton chant la nouuele saison.
Mais ores plus content de ta douce prison,
Tu ne veux que chanter ton bien heureux
seruaige;
Tout autre prisonnier perd soubdain le
courage,
Mais toi de l'augmenter as meilleure raison.
Ta prison est de bois, & de fer est la
mienne,
Tu t'attens de rentrer en la franchise tienne,
Et moy plus malheureux n'espere iamais
rien.
Toi de voir ma Maistresse as cent mille
allegresses
Et moy pour l'avoir veuë ay cent mille des-
tresses,
Peusse-ie mon destin changer avec le tien.

Vago uccellin, ch'alla finestra canti
Di madonna rinchiuso in stretta gabbia;
Tu già solevi andar tra liti e sabbia
Libero e sciolto con compagni erranti.
Di stare in carcer ti rallegrì e canti
E gli altri prigionier moron di rabbia,
Credo che la dolcezza di lei abbia
Conversi i lieti versi in tristi pianti.
Tu sei fra stecchi preso e io in catena,
Tu sei propinquo a chi ti può lasciare,
Io lungi a colei che al fin mi mena.
Tu di vederla puoi contento stare,
Io d'averla veduta ho doglia e pena:
Potessi io teco el mio destin mutare.

A well-worn theme, found in almost all the Italian sonneteers and originally derived from Ovid's *Tristia* (IV. vi. 1-16), is reproduced almost verbatim in Sonnet XX, from a rendering of Pamfilo Sasso (or more properly Sassi), one of the Ferrarese group of which Tebaldeo was the head, whose sonnets were first published in 1500:

Le soigneux labourer avec le temps
ameine
Dessous le ioug pesant le plus braue taureau,
Et le faulcon niais au vol de maint oiseau
Avec le tens encore on façonne en la pleine.
On range avec le temps le lyon à la
cheine,
Et l'appriuoise lon comme vn petit aigneau,
Voire avecques le tens par les gouttes de
l'eau

Col tempo el villanel al giogo mena
El tòr sì fiero e sì crudo animale;
Col tempo el falcon sì usa a menar l'ale
E ritornar a te chiamato a pena.
Col tempo sì domestica in catena
El bizzarro orso, e'l feroce cingiale;
Col tempo l'acqua, che è sì molle e frale

Se cauent les rochers qu'on tailleroit à peine.
 Avec le meisme tens le vieil chesne se
 rompt,
 Et voit on le sommet du plus superbe mont
 S'abaisser à l'egal de la pleine campagne:
 Mais ie ne puis Maistresse amollir la
 durté
 De ton cœur rigoureux, qui passe d'aspreté
 Taureau, faulcon, lyon, rocher, arbre & mon-
 tagne.

Rompe el dur saaso, come el fosse arena.
 Col tempo ogni robusto arbor cade;
 Col tempo ogni alto monte si fa basso,
 Et io col tempo non posso a pietade,
 Mover un cor d'ogni dolcezza casso;
 Onde avanza di orgoglio e crudeltade
 Orso, toro, leon, falcone e sasso.

Yet another sonnet of *Les Soupirs* (No. LIX) appears to have been adapted from the same poet rather¹ than from Petrarch:

S'amour est vne ardeur, d'où me vient
 tant de glace?
 S'amour est aueuglé, comment me fait il
 veoir?
 S'amour est si douteux, où pren-ie mon
 espoir?
 Et s'il est vng plaisir, que n'a t il en moy
 place?
 S'amour est libre & franc, d'où vient
 donc qu'il m'enlasse?
 S'amour est vne paix, que ne la pui-ie auoir?
 S'amour est vne mort, que me vault le dou-
 loir?
 Et s'il est vn repos, d'où vient donc qu'il me
 lasse? etc.

Se amor è tanto amar come è chiamato,
 Perchè è sì dolce ogni amoroso affanno?
 E s'egli è dolce, come è fier tiranno?
 E s'egli è fier, come è tanto onorato?
 S'è liberal, perchè se dice ingrato?
 Se'l serva fede, come è pien d'inganno?
 Se non la serva, perchè d'anno in anno
 De mal in peggio va chi è innamorato? etc.

To the student of the sonnet in France Pamfilo Sasso is particularly interesting from the fact that he supplied models for at least a dozen of Desportes' sonnets.²

Olivier de Magny does not seem to have borrowed much from the more famous Serafino of Aquila. It is not improbable, however, that he came across some or all of the sonnets of the quattrocentists he imitated in editions of the works of that celebrated improviser in which they were not infrequently surreptitiously included. Nevertheless Sonnet L appears to be modeled on the following composition of Serafino rather than on Petrarch's "Quando'l sol bagna in mar l'aurato carro," in spite of the similarity of the opening lines:

Lors que le cler Soleil faisant place à la
 nuit,
 Plonge son char doré dedans la mer pro-
 fonde,

Quando il carro del sol nel mar s'asconde
 E riman l'aria scolorita intorno

¹ The immediate source (vide Vianey, *Le Pétrarquisme*, p. 210) is a sonnet of Britonio, whose *Rime* appeared in 1519.

² This interesting discovery is due to MM. Vianey and Vaganay (*Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, X, 277).

Et lors que par le ciel ses cheuault il conduit,
 De ses raiz enflammées donnant lumiere au monde:
 Bref de iour & de nuit le malheur qui me suit
 Dessus moy miserable immobile se fonde:
 Et si rien me soulage, & si rien ne me nuyt,
 C'est le seul passetemps de la Muse faconde.
 Les seuls vers de la Muse allegent mes ennuy,
 Et seuls me font passer & les jours & les nuicts,
 Quelque peu consolé parmy tant de martire.
 Etc.

Gli ucel lassando il bel cantar del giorno
 Prenden quiete alla sicura fronde.
 Et io che mai non ebbi ore ioconde
 La notte al canto e al sospirar ritorno,
 Ch'è allor nel petto un modular adorno
 Pensando a le mie pen ch' amor m'infonde.
 Prendo la notte in nel cantar riposo,
 Ch' amor m' insegna di sfocar cantando
 Quel che l' di tengo per vergogna ascoso, etc

The device of printing the same word in the same line or at the beginning of the next line as in Sonnet LXIX:

Maistresse, ie vouldroy, ie vouldroy bien descrire
 Descrire bien le mal, le mal que i'ay pour toy,
 Pour toy i'endure tant, i'endure tant d'esmoï,
 Qu'à la fin tu prendrois pitié de mon martire.
 Je fay bien quelque fois, quelque fois à ma lyre,
 A ma lyre chanter, chanter quelle est ma foy.

the French poet doubtless imitated from certain *strambotti* of the same poet (e. g., "Quando non mi darai più foco foco")—or of Pamfilo Sasso, for he too made use of this childish device, though it must be confessed that neither of them handled it with the same skill as the author of *Les Soupirs*.¹

Olivier de Magny's dependence on the quattrocentists is further exemplified in Sonnet CVI in which he gallicizes almost word for word a pretty piece of Marcello Filosseno, the author of a miscellany of *strambotti*, sonnets, satires, and *capitoli*, published at Venice in 1507, under the title *Silve de M. Philoxeno*:

Pauvre Aueugle qui vas en mandiant du pain,
 Et qui plains le malheur dont ta vie est pourueü,
 Tu n'es seul contre qui la fortune est esmeü,
 Elle ha mis dessus moy plus rudement la main.
 J'ay bien veu quelque fois que i'estoy libre & sain,
 Mais ores i'ay perdu & le cuer & la veüé,
 Toy d'un fidele chien seurement par la rue,
 Et moy estant guidé d'un Aueugle incertain.

Cieco, che vai qui mendicando il pane
 E te lamenti ognor con umil verso,
 Già non sei solo in tal dolor summerso,
 Chè in varii modi van le sorte umane.
 Un tempo ebbi mie membra liete e sane
 Et or l' anima e il core insieme ho perso,
 E vo seguendo un ceco ognor disperso,
 E tu guidato sei da un fidel cane.

¹J. Vianey shows (*Le Pétrarquisme*, p. 216) that De Magny's immediate model for that trick was one of the madrigals of Luigi Cassola—the Cassola whom Du Bellay mentions in the second preface to *l'Olive*.

Nous mandions tous deux pour sub-
stanter noz vies,
Mais tu meux à pitié ceux à qui tu mandies,
Et nul n'en veult auoir de mon mal doulou-
reux.

Ton ame est en franchise, & captiue est
la mienne,
Vy donques plus content en l'infortune
tienne,
Puis que ie t'accompagne & suis plus mal-
heureux.

Tu il cibo, io il mio cor vo meddicando,
Tu acquisti assai per pietà dil tuo pianto,
Ma ognun non mi può dar quel che adi-
mando.

Tu hai l'alma e il cor, et io son mezo
morto,
Dunqua sta lieto al caso mio pensando,
Chè l'altrui danno a' miseri è conforto.

The same poet appears to have at least suggested Sonnet
CXIV:

Vine qui viure peult content allaigre-
ment,
Car ie ne vis, Paschal, qu'en estat miserable;
Gouste qui peult gouter vn plaisir agreable,
Car ie ne gouste rien que tristesse & tour-
ment.

Sento qui peult sentir son heur abondam-
ment,
Car ie ne sens plus rien qu'un malheur
effroyable;

Prenne qui prendre peult du repos amyable,
Car ie n'ay que travail & peine incessam-
ment.

Paisse qui paistre peult son penser d'es-
perance,
Car ie ne pais le mien que de dure souffrance,
De souspirs & de pleurs, d'ennuys & de dou-
leur, etc.

Chi non pò come vol vive in affanno
Chi può, come a lui piace se governa,
Parmi che questa usanza ormai sia eterna
Che le cose dil mondo a un modo vanno.

Chi vive lieto e chi teme gran danno,
E chi dà legie a la luce superna,
Tal par che l'altrui fallo ognor discerna
E non se acorge dil suo proprio inganno.

Chi teme l'altrui dir, chi'l stima poco,
Chi brama de arichirsi e chi non cura,
Altri prendon di me, io d' altri ioco, etc.

This completes, as far as I am aware, the list of loans that Olivier de Magny made from the sonneteers of the school of Tebaldeo and Serafino, but it by no means exhausts the sum of his debt to the Italians. He was eclectic in his taste and widely read, and consequently could not resist the temptation of pillaging the sonnets of the author of the *Orlando Furioso*, "le cigne ferrarois du Furieux," as he styles him, more especially as his friend Du Bellay had already recommended Ariosto as a suitable model in the preface of the first edition of *l'Olive*, and, adding example to precept, had borrowed largely from him for the composition of that collection. In one instance he followed a method much affected by Du Bellay of expanding a description of the *Orlando* into a sonnet. This he did in Sonnet XVII which is a paraphrase of the first two octaves of Canto XXI of that epic. Sonnet XXXV is a close adaptation of the Sixth Sonnet of Ariosto:

Ce beau poil est le reth auquel ie fu surpris,
 Ce regard attrayant est le traict qui m'en tume
 Ce beau sourcil est l'arc, & l'œil brun de Madame
 Est cil qui m'a feru, non l'enfant de Cypris.
 Dans si belle prison ie nourris mes esprits,
 Ie nourris la blesseure au profond de mon ame,
 Et captif, & nauré, ie n'adore ou reclame,
 Que l'œil qui m'a blessé, & le poil qui m'a pris.
 L'or de ces beaux cheueux cil des Indes surmonte,
 Les raiz de ce bel œil font obscurcir de honte
 Les rayons du soleil quand plus cler il reluyt.
 Heureux donc qui captif dans ce beau poil demeure,
 Fern de l'œil qui peut faire un iour d'une nuit,
 Mais plus heureux encor s'il conuient qu'il y meure.

La rete fu di queste fila d'oro,
 In che'l mio pensier vago intricò l'ale;
 E queste ciglia l'arco, e'l guardo strale,
 E i feritor' questi begli occhj foro.

Io son ferito, io son prigion per loro:
 La piaga è in mezzo il cor aspra e mortale;
 La prigion forte; e pur in tanto male,
 E chi ferimmi, e chi mi prese adoro.

Per la dolce cagion del languir mio,
 O del morir, se potrà tanto il duolo,
 Languento godo, e di morir desio;

Pur ch'ella, non sapendo il piacer ch'io
 Del languir m'abbia e del morir, d'un solo
 Sospir mi degni, o d'altro affetto pio.

In like manner Sonnet XCI presents a close paraphrase of the twelfth sonnet:

L'un vantera l'or frisé de ces tresses,
 L'autre cet œil qui fait honte au soleil,
 L'autre ce teint de cinabre vermeil,
 L'autre ce rix pour ses delicatesses.

L'autre ce port imitant les Déesses,
 Ou ces deux brins de coral nompareil,
 Ou cette voix qui charme d'un sommeil
 Le fier orgueil des plus fieres rudesses;

Mais cest esprit qui descendu des cieux
 Flambe icy bas comme au temple des Dieux
 Flambe Cynthis, ou Venus, ou l'Aurore

Ie veulx sans plus sur ma lyre chanter,
 Et de l'oubly ses vertuz exempter,
 Maugré le tens qui les ans nous denore.

Altri loderà il viso, altri le chiome
 De la sua donna, altri l'avorio bianco
 Onde formò natura il petto e'l fianco;
 Altri darà a' begli occhj eterno nome.

Me non bellezza corruttibil, come
 Un ingegno divino ha mosso unquanco;
 Un animo così libero e franco,
 Come non senta le corporee some;

Una chiara eloquenza che deriva
 Da un fonte di saper; una onestade
 Di cortesi atti, a leggiadria non schiva.

Che s'in me fosse l'arte a la bontade
 De la materia ugnal, ne farei viva
 Statua, che dureria più d'una etade.

Both these renderings may be compared to Du Bellay's versions of the same pieces in *l'Olive* (Nos. X and XVIII). As if to make up for his neglect of Bembo in *Amours*, Olivier de Magny intercalated several of the Cardinal's compositions in his second sonnet-sequence. Sonnet XXII, to which Sonnet II dealing with much the same theme may be compared, is manifestly adapted from Bembo's canzone: "O Rossignuol che'n queste verdi fronde," while containing reminiscences of his sonnet: "Soave angel ch'al mio dolce soggiorno" and of Petrarch's "Vago

angelletto che cantanda vai," the original parent of them all. Sonnet XLVII, in spite of a few variations in the phraseology, renders another of Bembo's sonnets with the usual literalness:

Ces beaux cheueux dorés, ce beau front spacieux,	Crin d'oro crespo, e d'ambra tersa e pura,
Ce teint blanc & vermeil, ce beau sourcil d'ebene,	Ch' a l'aura, su la neve, ondeggi e vole;
Cette bouche d'œillets & de muse toute pleine,	Occhi soavi e più chiari che'l Sole,
Cet œil, ains ce soleil digne de luyre aux cieux,	Da far giorno seren la notte oscura;
Cette gorge de liz, ce sein délicieux,	Riso, ch' acquetta ogni aspra pena dura;
Où Venus à l'esbat ces trois Graces ameine,	Rubini e perle, ond' escono parole
Ce beau port de Déesse, & ce chant de Syrène,	Si dolci, ch' altro ben l'alma non vuole;
Qui tire à scy le cuer des hommes & des dieux:	Man d'avorio, che i cor distringe e fura;
Ce riz qui peult fleschir le Scythe plus sauvaige,	Cantar, che sembra d'armonia divina;
Cest esprit desia meur en son verdissant age,	Senno maturo a la più verde etade:
Et ce parler disert qui coule si tresdoux,	Leggiadria non veduta unqua fra noi;
Alument celle ardeur qui brule en ma poitrine,	Giunta a somma beltà somma onestade,
Dame, pour vostre amour, & sont encore en vous,	Fur l'esca del mio foco; e sono in voi
Graces qu'à peu de gens la Nature destine.	Grazie, ch'a pochi il ciel largo destina.

Change of form does not prevent us from identifying Sonnet CLXXI ("Qui desire sçavoir quelle chose est amour") as a condensation of Bembo's famous *capitolo* "Amor è Donne care un vano e fello." The mention of Bembo leads naturally to a consideration of those of his disciples whose sonnets Olivier de Magny utilized for the composition of *Les Soupirs*. For this cycle he did not make much use of Giolito's selection, as he had done for *Amours*, which goes to show that the range of his reading in the Venetian Petrarchists was wider than that represented by this popular anthology. He had recourse to Giolito (II, 133) once only for the material of Sonnet CLXXII, which faithfully reproduces a composition of an unknown author which had already served for Sonnet XCI of *l'Olive*:

Voz celestes beaultez, Dame, rendez aux cieux,	Rendete al ciel le sue bellezze sole,
Et aux Graces rendez voz graces immortelles,	E le gratie a le gratie, onde conquiso
Et rendez voz vertuz aux neuf doctes pucelles,	Havete ogn' alma, che vi mira fiso
Et au soleil rendez les raiz de vos beaux yeux.	Di cui più pianger, che parlar si suole.

Rendez, dame, rendez vostre riz gracieux,
 Et de vostre beau sein les pomettes nouvelles
 A la mere d'amour, qui les fait ainsi belles,
 A fin d'enamourer les hommes & les dieux.
 Rendez à Cupidon son arc & ses sagettes,
 Dont vous rendez si bien les personnes sub-
 gettes,
 Et puis ayant rendu ces diuines beaultez,
 Et toutes ces vertuz d'où vous les auez
 prises,
 Vous verrez qu'en rendant ces graces tant
 exquises,
 Vous vous trouverez seule avec vos cruaultez.

Et rendete i pensier e le parole
 E i sembianti e gli sguardi, e'l dolce riso,
 Et tutti gli honor suoi al paradiso,
 E al Sol rendete la beltà del Sole.
 Et rendete ad Amor l'arco e lo strale;
 Et rendete lor prima libertade
 De l'alme tolte a i miseri mortali.
 Che s'ogni altrui rendete in questa
 etade;
 Non restera se non con mille mali
 Altro di vostro in voi che crudeltade.

Although Sonnet LXXII owes something to Petrarch's "Passa la nave mia colma d'obblio," it is evidently constructed, more particularly the two tercets, on the model of one, a distant descendant of the Petrarchan prototype, by Lodovico Domenichi:

A toute heure ie voy croistre l'ire &
 l'orgueil
 De l'orage cruel qui si fort me tempeste,
 A toute heure ie voy cent flots dessus ma
 teste,
 Pour me faire en vn gouffre vn horrible
 cercueil.
 Mon bateau n'est chargé que d'angoisse
 & de dueil,
 Et quelque temps qu'il face il est tousiours
 en queste,
 L'anchre, c'est ma raison qui iamais ne
 l'arreste,
 Pour peuz d'un vent contraire ou crainte
 d'un escueil.
 Toy donc, mon Avanson, qui vois quel est
 l'orage,
 Et qui peuz, si tu veuz, me sauuer du nau-
 frage.
 M'esloignant du danger, du mal & du soucy,
 Mets la main au tymon, & me fais faire
 voile
 En plus heureuse mer & sous plus douce
 estoile,
 D'un fauorable vent m'enleuant hors d'icy.

Io che solco d'amor le torbid' onde
 Con mal sicuro e disarmato legno,
 Non pur del ciel, ma di mia stella a sdegno,
 Che già mostrommi il lume, or lo nasconde;
 Sento procelle in mare aspre e profonde
 Crescer più sempre, e non veggio alcun
 segno.
 Perch' io mi creda di salute degno,
 Ma temo pur che il mio naviglio affonde.
 Che debbio io far, Remigio? A cui mi
 volgo?
 Il periglio è vicino, lontano il porto
 Sì, che le vele indarno anco raccolgo.
 Tu che per prova sei nocchiero accorto
 Porgi mano al mio scampo or ch'io ti tolgo
 Per luce e guida in cammin cieco e torto.

Another Bembist¹ of later date, in the person of Orsatto Giustiniano of Venice, furnished the material for Sonnet LXXVII, in which the French poet may be said this time to have bettered his instruction:

Que verrez vous mes yeux desormais
 d'agreable,
 Puis qu'il me fault partir & changer de
 seieur?

Occhi, perchè sì lieti oltre l'usato
 Siete, se pianto sol piacer vi suole?

¹ Here J. Vianey (*Le Pétrarquisme*, p. 211) points to Marcello Filosseno.

Que verrez vous mes yeux & de nuit & de
iour,
Qui ne vous soit par tout par trop espouven-
table?
Quel chemin prendrez vous, qui ne soit
desuoyable
Pauvres pieds douloureux, attendant le
retour?
Vous oreilles aussi pleines de mon amour,
Que pourrez vous ouir qui ne soit effroyable?
Bouche que ferrez vous? ie paistray de
fiel,
Et de cris & de plaints ie rempliray le ciel.
Mains, que toucherez vous? toutes choses
horribles.
Et toy mon pauvre cuer? ie mourray de
langueur.
Sus donq' apretez vous à ces tourments ter-
ribles,
Pauvres yeux, pieds & mains, bouche,
oreilles & cuer.

Perchè tosto vedremo il nostro sole
Da noi sì lungamente in van bramato.
Orecchie, a che desir tanto v'è nato
Di vostre parti usar? Perchè Amor vuole
De le soavi angeliche parole
Farci tosto messagge al cor beato.
Piedi, ond'è chesi pronto avete il passo?
Perchè n'andremo a quelle luci sante,
Ch'avrian virtù di far muovere un sasso.
Ma' tu, cor, perchè vai così tremante
A tanta gioja? Perchè io temo, lasso,
Di perir per dolcezza a lei davante.

Although in the following instance Olivier de Magny did not follow his pattern with his customary servility, it requires no great perspicacity to detect the original of Sonnet CXII in the well-known composition of Celio Magno, a friend of Giustiniano, whose fame lasted till the rise of the *Seicento*; Marino, coupling their names in one of the *Ritratti* of his *Galleria*, celebrates him and Giustiniano as "d'Apollo e d'Amor lumi gemelli:"

Dame, ie viens à toy ce poignard en ma
main,
Afin de te prier de finir mon martire,
Ou bien en me donnant le bien que ie desire,
Ou bien m'outreperçant de ce fer inhumain.
Auras tu donc sur moy telle ire & tel
dedain,
Que du don de mercy me vouloir escondire?
Auras tu donc sur moy tel dedain & telle ire.
Que vouloir de ce fer m'outrepercer le sein?
Sus-sus ne tarde plus, ie voy bien à ta
mine
Que tu me veux ficher ce fer dans la poitrine,
Prens le donc, le voilà, occis moy vistement,
etc.

Poichè nè il lungo mio gridar mercede
Con voce dal dolor già stanca e vinta,
Nè la fronte portar di morte tinta,
Donna, al mio foco interno acquistan fede;
Questo ferro prendete, e là ve siede
L'imagin vostra nel mio cor dipinta,
Fate a gli occhj la via, ch' ivi se finta,
O se vera è mia flamma, a pien sì vede.
Nè si resti per voi; stimando errore
Quinci mostrar che dal benigno aspetto
Abbiate dentro sì diverso il core, etc.

A consideration of Olivier de Magny's *Soupirs* would be incomplete without some mention of the famous sonnet to Charon ("Holla Charon, Charon, nautonnier infernal") which filled the court of Henry II with enthusiasm, and was set to music by the celebrated composer Orlando di Lasso. Although it requires no great knowledge of Italian poetry to suspect that it is derived

from one of the quattrocentists, it is only recently (1905) that its exact source has been determined by J. Vianey¹ (*Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, XII, 467). The French scholar, taking a hint from one of E. Pèrcopo's publications,² has demonstrated that it is an elaboration of a *strambotto* ("Caron, Caron! Chi è l'importun que grida?") attributed to Marc' Antonio Magno di Santa Severina, a poet about whom very little is known, by Fabrizio Luna, the author of a curious work entitled *Vocabulario di cinq mila Vocabuli Toschi nō men oscuri che utili e neccesarij del Furioso, Boccaccio, Petrarca e Dante; novamēte dechiarati e raccolti* (Napoli, 1536). Magny probably heard it sung or recited at Rome during his stay there, or may have come across it in Luna's treatise, where it appears most unexpectedly in a chapter with the rubric "Di Q. Lettera."

This sonnet of Olivier de Magny has a special interest for students of English literature, and for that reason I may be excused for having dwelt on it more amply; it seems very probable that it was from it that Herrick, who is known to have been acquainted with the poetry of the *Pléiade*, derived the idea of his two dialogue pieces—*Charon and Philomel* (in *Hesperides*), and *Charon and Eucosmia, upon the Death of Henry, Lord Hastings*. The first piece especially, though considerably expanded, bears a close resemblance to what I take to be its original.

As far as I am aware at present the instances quoted in this paper represent fairly completely Olivier de Magny's indebtedness in *Amours* and *Soupirs* to the Italian sonneteers. The evidence is strong, not to say crushing, and it is difficult to see how the French poet can withstand the accusation of wholesale plagiarism. This charge being admitted, how does it affect our estimate of the poet? M. Favre (*op. cit.*, p. 153), with the zeal of a special pleader, and with startling irresponsibility, makes light of Olivier de Magny's lack of originality, though it must be admitted that he had no idea of its extent, by asserting that in the sixteenth

¹ H. Morf, in his manual on the French literature of the Renaissance (*Das Zeitalter der Renaissance*, 1898, p. 172), had already identified the source of Magny's sonnet, but, by a singular error, attributes to Fabrizio Luna the *strambotto* from which it is derived.

² The Italian original is published on p. 29 of E. Pèrcopo's *Madrigalisti napoletani anteriori al MDXXXVI* (Napoli, MDCCCLXXXVII).

century form was everything in love-poetry. This assertion contains a manifest exaggeration, but even if it conformed more exactly with the truth it could not affect our judgment of the case. Other critics, no better informed, have defended Olivier de Magny's methods and those of some of his fellows in the sixteenth century on equally erroneous grounds. They have argued that the poets of that time based their whole poetic scheme on imitation. Was not the basis of Du Bellay's poetic evangel imitation? They, too, have allowed their zeal to outrun their discretion. By "imitation" both Du Bellay and his chief Ronsard meant something very different from what we do. To them it spelt what may be called assimilation or *innutrition*, to borrow M. Faguet's word. They have made their meaning plain in more than one passage. The poet was urged, as in the *Défense* for example, to imitate the ancients and the Italians, but only in the sense that he must absorb and digest their ideas to his own use—"se transformant en eux les devorant, et, après les avoir bien digerez, les convertissant en sang et nourriture."¹ He might adopt the images, the turns, and even the thoughts of his model, provided he breathed into them that undefined and intangible thing, the soul of real poetry, which we call spirit. This is how Ronsard and Du Bellay understood poetry; their aim and ideal was what may be called original imitation. They did not always realize their ambition—in fact it was only fully realized by the great poets of the seventeenth century—yet their teaching and their works leave no doubt on that score. True they faltered at first, but no one would think of judging Ronsard on his Pindaric *Odes* or Du Bellay on *l'Olive*, that mosaic of Petrarchan conceits. That would be a vital error, substituting the accidental and the exceptional for the essential. To set off against this borrowed tinsel they have store enough of precious jewels, chiseled with incomparable art, which live and always will, while the originals are long since forgotten. They did not copy; they created anew, and their own genius infused and molded the matter they drew from foreign sources. In this sense, and in this sense only, can their poetry be called imitative. The case is very different with Olivier de Magny. He

¹ *La défense et illustration de la langue françoise*, I, 7.

did copy. Except in his *Odes*,¹ by which he must stand or fall, he rarely succeeded in emancipating himself from servile imitation. He failed to assimilate his models, and now that the nature and extent of his plagiarisms have been revealed, it seems evident that a large proportion at least of his sonnets must be relegated to the rank of interesting literary exercises. A cursory perusal of the sonnets quoted will, I think, suffice to attest the justice of my conclusions.

L. E. KASTNER

ABERYSTWYTH .
September, 1908

¹ The *Odes*, published in 1559, consist of four books. The longer odes, addressed to various friends and patrons, are wearisome enough reading, but the shorter and more lively pieces of the three latter books reveal genuine poetic gifts. In some of the *Odes* Magny borrowed from Horace and Theocritus, on the whole with good taste and discrimination.

SPANISH ETYMOLOGIES

Etymologien beweist man nicht, sie müssen durch die ihnen inwohnende Schlagkraft wirken. Aber man kann bei einer guten Etymologie doch jederzeit manches anführen, was zu ihrer Bestätigung dient.—Skutsch, Festschrift C. F. W. Müller, 1900, p. 85.

1. *Anviso*

The word occurs also as *ambiso*; once, *Fuero Juzgo* p. 3 V. L. 30, I have found *ambisso*, an incorrect spelling as shown by the rimes S. Mill. 9 *ambisa*: *guisa*: *divisa*: *aguisa*, 460 *parayso*: *promiso*: *anviso*: *misso*, *Milagr.* 14 *paraiso*: *misso*: *anviso*: *viso*.

Anviso < **ante visu* as *annado* < *ante natu*. The intermediate stage is seen in *Fuero Juzgo* p. 3 V. L. 33 *ant viso*. The *Thesaurus* has *antevidet* (*Prud. apoth.* 804) and *ante vident* (*Claud.* 20, 500).

For the spelling *ambiso*, s. Meyer-Lübke I §484. For the formation *ambisa* S. Mill. 9 = sagacity, s. Menéndez Pidal, *Manual* §80, 3; Meyer-Lübke II §486. Cf. *vista*.

As for the meaning of *anviso* = foreseeing, far-seeing, sagacious etc., *anviso* has joined the large number of perfect passive participles which have taken on active meaning, or more strictly in our case, present active meaning, s. Nebrija (*Viñaza* c. 402), *Correas*, *Arte de la Lengua española* (*Viñaza*) p. 185, *Bello-Cuervo* §1117, *Diez* p. 956 (= III p. 264), Meyer-Lübke III §13, *Lang*, *Canc. gall.-cast.* I p. 162. Cf. *auanuisto*: *Prim. Crón. Gen.* p. 541 a 15 *enuio a aquel onrrado don Yugo abbat de Crunniego a rogarle que enuiasse un uaron sabio et auanuisto en las cosas que eran de fazer*; *mirado* (*Nebrija*); *percibido*: *Fuero Juzgo* p. 2 b *Deve* (sc. *El fazedor de las leyes*) *seer muy percibido en dar conseio*, *Sacrif.* 72 *Dixole* (sc. *à su compañía*) *que velase, soviessse percebida*; *apercibido* (*Cuervo, Dicc.*);¹ *It. arveduto* (*Diez*).

In *enuio*, which I have found as early as *Calila* (*Allen*) p. 60,

¹Cf. Old Fr. *perceû*, *aperceû* *Tobler, Mélanges* I p. 186; Old Port. *apercebudo* *Lang, Denis* p. 124.

5 etc. and as late as Lucas Fernandez pp. 145, 206,¹ the frequent prefix *en-* has replaced *an-*.

A Latin *ante visu*, at least in Spain, is further attested by the learned form *anteviso*: Fuero Juzgo p. 3 b *El iuez deve seer entendudo en iudgar derecho: deve seer muy anteviso . . .*²

2. Fr. *par cœur*, Sp. *de coro*

1. Tobler, Sitzungsber. d. preuss. Ak., 1904, p. 1272, has shown that *cœur* in such phrases as *savoir par cœur* etc. is connected with *cor*, not with *chorus* as D'Ovidio suggested. He foresaw also that an investigation of the history of Sp. *saber de coro* would not change this fact. The instances Tobler lacked at the time to corroborate his idea, I supply here with the pleasure a grateful pupil feels when he can be of some service to his revered teacher.

Old Sp. *cuer* = memory, *saber de cuer* = to know by heart. This form is the predecessor of *saber de coro*. Concilio de Coyanza (Muñoz p. 215) *E los clerigos ensinen á los fijos de la iglesia é á los infantes el credo yn Deum, et el pater noster, asi que lo tengan de cor* (V. L. Assi *que lo saban decor*).³ Sacrificio 164 *Dice* (sc. el Sacerdot) *essas palabras, ca de cor* (Janer *cort*) *las retiene*. Alex. 18 *Nada non oluidaua* (sc. Alexandre) *de quanto que oya, Nunca oya* (l. oye) *razon que en (!) coraçon* (l. *cuer*) *non tenia* (Morel-Fatio 18 *non le caye de mano quanto que veye*). 38 (Alexander speaks) *De cuer* (M.-F. 39 *cor*) *sey los actores, de liuro non he cura*. 717 *Porque tenie* (sc. Alexandre) *los nomnes todos de coraçon*. 1637 *Escreuió* (sc. Apelles) [*y*] *la cuenta ca de cor* (M.-F. 1778 *coraçon*) *la sabia*. Appoll. 597 *Reçibieron* (sc. el conçeio de Tarsso) *al Rey commo ha su ssennyor, Cantando los responssos de libro e de cor*. Boc. Oro p. 157 (Timaeus to Socrates) *Si algund omne te encontrase en la carrera e te preguntase por alguna cosa de saber, é terrnias por bien de lo dexar*

¹ The glossary reads *enviso*, the original ed. has at least once (p. 145) *embiso*, Cañete prints both times *en viso*.

² Cf. Fuero de Sepúlveda p. 76 *Juez sabidor, é anviso, é entendedor*.

³ The Latin text, La Fuente, Hist. de las Universidades [I], 1884, p. 58, reads: "Doccant autem clerici filios Ecclesie, et infantes, ut symbolum et orationem Dominicam memoriter teneant."

fasta que tornases a tu posada a catar en tus libros? E pues esto non es bien pugna de saber lo que sopieres de coraçon. 7 Part. (1807) I pp. 20 *Ca saber las leyes non es tan solamente en aprender et decorar (V. L. en aprender de corazon) las letras dellas, mas en saber el su verdadero entendimiento.* 258 *et por ende deben (sc. los exôrcistas) saber estas conjuraciones de cuer porque las sepan decir quando menester fuere.*¹ Prim. Crón. Gen. pp. 94a 49 *nunqua Julio Cesar tantas batallas ouo ni tantos embargos, ni ouo tanto de ueer que dexasse de leer ni de estudiar noche ni dia, et de aprender muy de coraçon.* 164a 44 *et retenie (sc. Sant Poncio) bien de coraçon lo que aprendie.*

During all this time there existed also *coro* < *choru* e. g. S. Dom. 88, S. Mill. 306.

The earliest instances of *de coro* which I have noted, belong to the sixteenth century. But the number of Spanish texts at my disposal is small. Moreover I have not read them systematically. The cases are: Torres Naharro I p. 386 (Moñiz to Osorio, who belittles something—the context is not quite clear to me) *¿Qué decís, que no os agrada? No sabeis el bien de coro: Voto á Dios, para ensalada Que vale su peso d'oro.* II p. 313 (here too the context is not clear to me) *Pues á osadas Que cualquier danza de espadas, Que os la sabia de coro.* Diego Sanchez de Badajoz II p. 202 Pastor. *¡Cuerpo ahora del rey moro, Alegais por buena cuenta Her contra Dios herramienta Y encraballo como á toro! Herrero. No, hermano, mas sé de coro Que su corazon cubierto(,) Convino que fuese abierto Do manó nuestro tesoro.* Venegas, Agon[ía de la Muerte] punt. 4 cap. 3. *Vemos que la memoria del célebro se halla en el corazón virtualmente, de donde tuvo origen esta habla Castellana, con que decimos tomar de coro, por decir tomar de corde, ò de corazón.*² Villalón, Viaje de Turquía p. 19b (NBAE II) *Vinome a la mano vn buen libro de medicina . . . y nunca hazia sino leer en él . . . y como yo tengo buena memoria, tomélo todo de coro.* Autos (Rouanet) III p. 334, 145 (Bobo to Amor Divino) *Señor, ya*

¹ The Dicc. Aut. s. v. *Coro*, probably following one of the earlier editions of the 7 Part., none of which is accessible to me, has *de eoro* instead of *de cuer* and continues: "porque las sepan decir de coro, quando menester fuere."

² Quoted from Dicc. Aut. s. v. *Coro*.

sabra de coro que yo no so tan culpado, pues a mi me an cristianado; que aquestotro, qu'es moro, meresçe pesar doblado. Timoneda(?) (Pedroso) p. 84a Cristóbal. Pues, Pedro, sé mi pastor Y apascienta mis ovejas. Pedro. Quisiera, buen Mayoral, Saberte honrar muy de coro. Barahona de Soto (Rodríguez Marín) p. 736 Y así, el que vive en miserable vida Tenga este verso escrito muy de coro: "Que nunca medra quien de sí se olvida." Fonseca. Vid. de Christ. tom. I. lib. I. cap. 2. Pero la doctrina de Christo Señor nuestro la hizo tan notoria, que saben ahora de coro los niños lo que los sabios entonces no alcanzaron.¹

Small as the number of instances is, we can add to the meanings of *de coro* given by the dictionaries, that of "certainly, firmly, well."

2. Perhaps *de coro* came into existence in the following way. Very early from *de cuer* (*cor*) a verb *decorar* = *tener de cuer* was formed. Similarly Prov. *decorar*, cf. Tobler, op. cit. p. 1277 note. As to such formations, s. Paul, *Prinzip. d. Sprachgesch.*³, p. 226. S. Oria 170 *Non echó esti sueño la duenna en olvido Ni lo que li dixiera Garcia su marido: Recontógelo todo a Munno su querido: El decorólo todo como bien entendido.* 171 *Bien lo decoró eso como todo lo al, Bien gelo contó ella, non lo aprendió (el) mal, Por end(e) de la su vida fizo libro caudal: Yo ende lo saque (esto) de esi su misal.* Alfonso, *Lapidario* f.^o 111 r.^o b *et presta* (sc. la piedra Anxoniz) *alos moços pora aprender leer et pora decorar todos los saberes.* Calila p. 4, 10 (Berzebuey speaks) *e ley libros, e conosçt e sope sus entendimientos, e afirmóse enel mi coraçon lo que ley delas escripturas delos filosofos. Et decoré las palabras delos sabios, e las questiones que fazian vnos aotros, e las disputaciones que fazian entre sy.* 7 Part. I p. 20 *Ca saber las leyes non es tan solamente en aprender et decorar las letras dellas, mas en saber el su verdadero entendimiento.* Juan Ruiz (Ducamin) 1200 *Por ende cada vno esta fabla decuere: quien asu enemigo popa a las sus manos muere . . .*

Cf. also *decorado* = *instruido, que sabe de memoria* (Sanchez). S. Mill. 22 *Fue en poco de tiempo el pastor psalteriado, De imnos*

¹ Quoted from Dicc. Ant. s. v. *Coro*.

è de canticos sopra bien decorado. Milagr. 745 *Si ante fo Teofilo bien quisto è amado, Fo depues mas servido è mucho maspreciado: Dios sennero lo sabe, que es bien decorado, Si li venie por Dios ò si por el peccado.*

From this *decorar* derives the postverbal **decoro* = memory, a late formation as the lack of the diphthong shows. It was immediately combined with about the same verbs as *de cuer*. Through haplology then *saber de coro* instead of *saber de decoro*. For cases of *de* instead of *de de*—, s. Rinconete y Cortadillo (Rodríguez Marín) p. 341; Tobler, *Mél.* p. 286 note.

3. *Duecho*

1. Corresponding to O. Fr. *duit d'aucune chose* etc.,¹ O. Pr. *doch*, *dueg de*, *dueich*, *dueitz de*, *dug de*, *du[e]g*,² *duitz*, *duh de*,³ O. Port. *doito de* etc.,⁴ we have in Spanish *ducho en* etc.⁵ As the sixteenth century is represented in Cuervo only by one instance (from Valdés), I may add a few more. Lucas Fernandez p. 147 *Pues dias ha que ño lo he ducho*. Diego Sanchez de Badajoz I p. 416 *desque al mal está ducho*, *Es muy recio de volver*. Lope de Rueda (1896) II p. 47 *pudiéraste llamar de veras bienaventurado, si fueras como yo ducho en amores*. Autos (Rouanet) II p. 434, 412 *Ducha estoy a la verdad de semejantes baldones*. And two Asturian cases: Caveda, *Poesías sel. en dial. ast.* pp. 71 (s. XVII) *una diosa*. . . . *Ducha en treveyos, ducha en espreñencia*. 132 (s. XVIII) *ye muy llistu nes guerres Y muy duchu en gobernar*.

Besides *ducho* we find *duecho*. This form is not so rare as Meyer-Lübke, *ZrP.* XXVII p. 252, and Baist, *Krit. Jahresber.* VIII, I p. 201, seem to think.⁶ Apart from Milagr. 149 *La madre gloriosa duecha de accorrer*, the instance to which Meyer-Lübke and Baist refer, I have noted: *Prim. Crón. Gen.* pp. 209b 28 *las*

¹ Cf. Richars li Biais 2446 note; Godefroy s. v. *Duire*.

² Cf. Levy, *Prov. Suppl.-Wb.* s. v. *Dozer*.

³ Cf. Levy, op. cit. s. v. *Duire*.

⁴ Cf. Lang, *ZrP.* XXXII p. 394.

⁵ Cf. Cuervo, *Dicc.* s. v.

⁶ "Duecho ist nur einmal handschr. bei Berceo überliefert, neben sonst einzig vorhandenem regelmässigem ducho (Sp. Spr. 23) . . . ich fürchte, dass duecho ein Fehler ist."

otras bestias brauas que son duechas (V. L. *duechas* EC, *duchas* OQBN) *de comer los cuerpos muertos*. 210 b 48 *et no eran duchos* (V. L. *duchos* EC etc., *duechos* Q) *de obedecer a ningun sennor estranno*. Encina¹ p. 122 *Quien es duecho de dormir Con el ganado de noche, No creas que no reproche El palaciego vivir*. Garay 399 *Quien de mucho mal es duecho, poco bien le abasta*.² Garay (Sbarbi, Refran. VII p. 65) *ya duecha es la loba de la sogá*. D. Quix. I ch. vii *el* (sc. Sancho) *no estaua duecho a andar mucho a pie*. Finally we have the statement of Covarruvias (1674) s. v. *Dvcho*: "*Dvcho*, en language antiguo Castellano, vale tanto como acostumbrado, del verbo Latino *duco* *ducis*. xi. *ductum*, porque la costumbre lleva tras si al hombre, si con particular aduertencia no se vâ a la mano. Algunos dizen *duecho*. no estoy *duecho*, no estoy acostumbrado, etc."

2. Concerning previous attempts to settle the etymology of these forms, I confine myself to the following remarks. Du Cange s. v. *Ductus* mentions a "*Vetus placitum ann. 876 editum a Baluzio in Append. ad Capitul. n. 104*"³ containing the phrase *mandatarius . . . qui legibus Ductus est*. Carpentier ib. observes: "*Legibus enim ductus*, idem mihi est quod, in legibus peritus, exercitatus; unde vetus Gallicum *Duit*, eodem intellectu, a verbo *Duire*, docere vel addiscere." There follow instances ss. XIV. XV.

Foerster, Rom. Stud. III p. 181, derives Fr. *duit* "kundig," Norm. *deit*, from *dpctum*, (Pr. *dohtz* in *ohtz larg*).

Levy enters *doch*—*du[e]g* under *Dozer*, *duitz*—*duh* under *Duire*.

Cornu, Gröber's Grundr. I p. 932, connects *adoito* "acostumado" with *edoctus*. Lang, ZrP. XXXII p. 394, refers for *doito de* etc. to O. Sp. *duecho* and Prov. *duch*, to Lanchetas (who deserves no mention), to Menéndez Pidal, Manual §122,

¹ Menéndez Pidal, Dial. leon. §3, 3, asserts: "en Lucas Fñz. *duecho* < *dóctu*." Probably a slip of memory for Encina. I have noted in Lucas Fernandez only *ducho* e. g. p. 147.

² Quoted from Cejador y Frauca, La Lengua de Cervantes II s. v. *Ducho*. He continues: "De *doctus* = *docto* salió *duecho* . . ." Not to be found in the ed. of Garay by Sbarbi, Refranero VII. For the correct form of the proverb, s. Valdés, Diál. de la Lengua (Böhmer) p. 383, 35.

³ I have not been able to verify this reference. Nor do I know of other examples of *ductus* = *peritus*. *Educere* = *educare* (Du Cange) is, of course, well known.

2 *ducho* < *ductu*, and to ZrP. XIX p. 535. Carolina Michaelis de Vasconcellos, at the latter place, says: "Ob [*doito*] auf *doctus* oder *ductus* zurückzuführen ist, steht übrigens noch nicht fest." In a note appended to this statement she seems to favor *ductus*.

Sanchez, II p. 503, expresses himself thus: "Aunque parece que [*duecho*] viene de *ductus*, creo con mas probabilidad que de *doctus* que significa enseñado y vale tanto muchas veces como *acostumbrado*. Tambien es prueba de esto el diptongo *ue* de *duecho* que suele tomarse de la *o* latina, como *bueno* de *bonus*." According to Cornu, Romania XIII p. 293, *duecho* Milagros 149 = **duytyo*. (?) Cuervo treats *ducho* and *duecho* under *Ducho*, derives *doito*, Prov. *duich*, *duit*, part. of *duire*, O. Fr. *duit*, *duire* from *ducere*, and confesses: "La forma *duecho* (Covarr.) es menos fácil de explicar en cuanto á la fonética." For an opinion by Menéndez Pidal, s. my note p. 6. Salvioni, Rom. XXXI p. 281, seeks the etymon of *duecho* in *dūctus*. His arguments are opposed by Meyer-Lübke, ZrP. XXVII p. 252, and Baist who, Krit. Jahresber. VIII, p. 201, remarks: "[*duecho*] könnte in einem asturisch-leonesischen Strich lautgerecht sein, nicht im Osten. Aber auch für *doctus* ist dort keine Analogie zu erbringen, *docho* fehlt kastilisch." If I am not mistaken, neither *docto* nor *doto* is found in Spain as early as *duecho*. There remains then only *ductu* as etymon. And that *duecho* comes from *ductu*, I hope to show by the following consideration.

3. Especially in Leonese-Asturian and Navarrese-Aragonese texts, and quite frequently, are noticed, besides the regular forms, some with the unwarranted diphthong *ie* or *ue*. A list of the latter may not be amiss.¹ This list is far from exhausting the matter; it does not even contain all of my material. I have omitted verb-forms, also infinitives and participles and their derivatives, finally words which it would take me here too long to discuss. For my purposes the list is sufficient.

¹ The list was arranged when Menéndez Pidal kindly presented me with a copy of his *Cantar de Mio Cid* I. On p. 150 he brings some cases of *ue* that supplement mine, and for these I refer the reader to him. I have thought it best to avail myself here only of his examples of *frueyt* and *adueyto*.

I. *ie*a) = Spanish *e* < Latin *ai***liegos** Fuero Juzgo p. 16 V. L.¹ 31 Esc. 6.² Fuero de Salamanca (1870) pp. 78, 95.b) = $e < \alpha + et$ **fiechos** F. Juzgo pp. II V. L. 7 Esc. 6; 9 VV. LL. 24 Esc. 6; 47 Esc. 6.
c) = $e < \bar{e}$ **riegla** F. Juzgo p. 100 V. L. 8 Esc. 1. Concilio de Coyanza (Muñoz p. 214). Libros de Astr. III p. 164.**rienes** F. Juzgo p. 109 V. L. 9 Camp.**sied** Sacrificio 22. Milagr. 57. 312. Fuero general de Navarra (1869) pp. 13a, 41b, 48a, 61a, 64a, 101b, 102a, 103ab, 104b, 105b, 106ab, 107b, 108a, 118a (*siedes*), 123a, 124a³—50b(*sed*).**sieto**⁴ F. Juzgo p. 146 VV. LL. 7 Esc. 6; 30 B. R. 1. F. Navarra pp. 37a, 70a, 100b, 126ab, 128b.d) = $e < i$ **cabiezas** F. Juzgo p. 9 V. L. 25 Esc. 6.**ciercos** F. Juzgo p. 105 V. L. 32 B. R. 1.⁵**dientro** Concilio de Coyanza (Muñoz p. 215). Libros de Astr. I pp. 121, 122, 123. Rato y Hévía s. v.**yende** F. Juzgo p. 10 V. L. 29 Esc. 3. and Camp.**iuieces** F. Juzgo p. 105 V. L. 7 S. B. "y así otras veces."e) = $i < i$

In the following two cases the Castilian forms show an *i* which is unexplained.

1. a) But over against *sin* in Castile, we have *sen* in Leon, Asturias (Rato y Hévía), Galicia (Cuveiro) etc.: Fuero de Avilés 22. Concilio de Leon (Muñoz pp. 81, 84); cf. β . Concilios de Leon (1267) (Esp. Sagr. XXXVI pp. 230, 231, 232 etc.). F. Juzgo pp. iii. ix, xi etc. Alex. 109 (M.-F. 121 reads differently), 121 (M.-F. 133 *syn*—*Sin*), 385 (M.-F. *syn*) etc. Torres Naharro I pp. 226, 228. The form is likewise fre-

¹ Unless otherwise stated, the text has the Castilian form.

² From MS Esc. 6 and next to it MS B. R. 1, as will be seen, come most of the instances. According to Hanssen, Conj. leonesa p. 8, the former represents an Asturian version, the latter the Leonese. It is a pity that nothing more definite can be said.

³ Through influence of *siella*?

⁴ If from *sēptu*, Gröber, Arch. lat. Lex. V p. 465.

⁵ The text has *circos*. The Castilian form corresponding to the meaning of the passage is *cercos*.

⁶ The text reads *alcaldes*, the Latin original, p. 81a note: "De personis iudicum."

quent in Navarre: F. Navarra pp. 7b, 8a, 17a, 20a, 35a, 42b etc.—*senes* 21a, 23b, 74a. Brutails, Documents des Arch. de la Chambre des Comptes de Navarre pp. 11, 19, 46. *Sen* could be the basis of

- β) **sien**. F. Juzgo p. 160a. Concilio de Leon (Muñoz pp. 74, 79 [V. L. *sen*; cf. α]). Carta de Hermandad . . . Valladolid 1293 (Esp. Sagr. XXXVI Ap. pp. clxii, clxiii, clxviii).—**sienes** Leyendas de José (Robles) pp. 191 n., 201 n., 211 n., 214 n. etc.

2. **dumiengo** F. Juzgo p. 13 V. L. 14 Esc. 3. Valuable also on account of the *umlaut*.

f) = *i* < *i*

lient = *linde* F. Navarra p. 120b.

If a midform with *e* has never existed, how are we to account for the form with *ie*? I venture to suggest that *liende* may be the result of the equation *timpo*: *tiempo* = *linde*: *liende*. If such an equation is admissible, it would likewise explain *dumiengo* and also *sien*.

II ue

a) = *o* < *au*

pueco F. Juzgo pp. 3 V. L. 17 Esc. 6; 35 V. L. 16 Esc. 5.

b) = *o* < *o* < *au*

puebres F. Juzgo pp. VI V. L. 24 S. B., Esc. 6. (*puebles*); 19 V. L. 2 Esc. 6; 29 V. L. 21 Esc. 6. and E. R.; 30 V. L. 18 Esc. 6; 32 V. L. 15 E. R. (*puebles*).

c) = *o* < *ō*

fuerma F. Juzgo p. 2 VV. LL. 5 Esc. 6. "y así despues;" 12 Esc. 6

d) = *o* < *ũ*

estuenza F. Juzgo pp. IV V. L. 15 B. R., Esc. 2. (*estuenze*);¹ 5 V. L. 42 B. R. 3. and Esc. 1. (*estuenze*); 47 V. L. 34 B. R. 1. (*estuenze*); 159 V. L. 19 B. R. 1; 169 V. L. 9 B. R. 1. (*estuenzia*); 171 V. L. 31 B. R. 1. (*estuenzia*). Lope de Rueda I pp. 223 and 225 (*entuenzes*—the word is used by Pablos Lorenzo, simple).² Autos III p. 420, 266 (*estuenzes*—Bobo). Lope, Las famosas Asturianas (BAE. XLI p. 482ab *estuenzes*).³

¹The text has *estoncia*, in the other cases *estonze*, *estonce*.

²A Galician? The same "simple" uses *prepuésito* (p. 194), *conueces* (p. 201). But the same and other words of similar kind (e. g. *neguecios* I p. 149) occur also in the speech of other "simples."

³In the same play appear *micsma* (pp. 473c, 475b, 482c), *nieña* (p. 475a). If these words were coined by Lope, as others surely are, they nevertheless deserve mentioning for they are well coined, conforming with a tendency of the "lenguaje antiguo" that had not escaped such a strict observer as was the poet.

- luedo** F. Juzgo p. 6 V. L. 10 Esc. 2.
puelvo F. Juzgo p. 177 V. L. 7 Malp. 2.
 e) = $u < \ddot{u} + lt$

a) In some community of Leon-Asturias (and of Navarre Aragon?), or at least in the mouths of some individuals, the Latin groups *lt*, *et* following \ddot{u} (and even \bar{u}) have not prevented the latter vowel from becoming *o*. Thus we find *mocho*: F. Juzgo pp. I V. L. 27 Esc. 6; 22 V. L. 26 E. R.; 24 V. L. 33 E. R. and Esc. 2; 43 V. L. 18 B. R. 2. Carlos Maynes p. 511a (NBAE. VI). Perhaps through Galician influence? Cf. Gal. *moito*, *froita*, Cornu §32. From such a form may have developed

β) **muechas** F. Juzgo p. 24 V. L. 33 S. B.¹
 f) = $u < \ddot{u} + ct$

a) F. Juzgo p. 156b *assi que en aquellos treinta dias non coman condocho* (V. L. *conducho*). **Docho* then may be considered the midform of

β) **duecho**. At any rate, the etymology *duecho* < *ductu* is further well supported by such unmistakable diphthongized forms from *ducere* as Crón. S. Juan de la Peña (1870) p. 25 *los ditos xpistianos (!) indueytos² de mas abundosa . . . deuocion*; 44 *Muerto el dito Emperador et el departimiento de las tierras et acabamiento adueyto, senyorió . . . Remiro*;³ 52 *el cuerpo de San Indaleci et de San Jayme . . . fué adueyto por reliquias en Sant Iohan de la Penya*.⁴ A[rchiv.] H[ist.] Benedictinas de Santa Cruz de Jaca *adueyto*.⁵

The semasiological side of the etymology does not require any discussion, cf. Foerster, *Rom. Stud.* III p. 181.

g) = $u < \bar{u} + ct$

- a) **frocho** F. Juzgo pp. I V. L. 22 Esc. 6; 27 V. L. 5 E. R.
 β) "**frueyt**, dos veces en un docum. en catalán, A H Benedictinas de Santa Cruz de Jaca . . . año 1294; y **fruayto** (*ua* = *ue* en bastantes documentos aragoneses) . . . en documento aragonés del mismo convento de Jaca."⁵

¹ Menéndez Pidal, *Cantar de Mio Cid* I p. 150, cites a case of *muecho* from the *Fuero de Sepúlveda*. To the best of my knowledge the word is not met with in the text. The glossary contains it, but the glossary is "para la mejor inteligencia de este fuero [de Sepúlveda] y otros." The editor Callejas has taken the word from the glossary of the F. Juzgo.

² Lat. text "inducti."

³ "Mortuo quidem dicto Imperatore, et partitione terrarum effectualiter facta . . ."

⁴ "corpora . . . fuerunt translata."

⁵ Quoted from Menéndez Pidal, *Cantar de Mio Cid* I p. 150 note 2.

h) = $u < \bar{u}$

- fuerto** F. Juzgo pp. 91 V. L. 16 S. B.; 101b; 119 V. L. 13 S. B.
nuedo¹ Libros de Astr. I pp. 83 and 140. II p. 251. Juan García de Vynuesa² (Canc. Baena (1851) p. 446b: *muedo*; Michel II p. 99b: *denuedo*). Thus still in Colunga, Munthe Anteckn. p. 81.
suelco F. Navarra p. 45a.

Similar to the case of *liende*, *suelco* etc. may be the result of the equation *furza*:³ *fuerza* = *sulco*: *suelco*. In fact, I feel more and more inclined to believe that equations like those mentioned are admissible (cf. §4), and that they will explain all the cases of the false diphthong *ue* or *ie* as contrasted with Castilian forms with *u* or *i*, so that midforms with *o* or *e* are not absolutely needed.

4. Menéndez Pidal, Dial. leon. §3, 1, states with regard to such forms as *fuerma*, *luedo*, *pueco* that they are due "á falsa corrección del dialecto leonés hablado por gallegos que, habituados á poner diptongo leonés en voces que en gallego tenían *o*, ponían fuera de propósito otras veces *ue* donde el leonés no tenía sino *o* como el gallego." In the light of the material presented in §3, this statement needs revision. It neither takes into account the cases of Leon.-Ast. *ue* over against Cast. *u*, nor those of *ie* over against Cast. *e*, respectively *i*, nor finally the cases of the false diphthong *ue* or *ie* in Navarre-Aragon. Need we, for the explanation of the latter fact, have recourse to Galician, respectively Catalan scribes? I think not, and offer the following simpler solution. Spanish diphthongization of tonic *ě*, *ô*, if it did not originate in Castile and spread from there to Leon-Asturias and Navarre-Aragon, checked by the influence of Galician-Portuguese (respectively Catalan), took on well-established forms earlier in Castile than in Leon-Asturias and in Navarre-Aragon. This fact is amply illustrated by a comparison of thirteenth-century documents from Castile with other documents from Leon-Asturias and Navarre-Aragon. The latter show not only far less consistency

¹ < *nādu*, Menéndez Pidal, Manual §2 (p. 6).

² "fué, á lo que parece, natural de Vinuesa de Melgar, en la provincia de Soria," Canc. Baena (1851) p. 685 a.

³ Cf. F. Juzgo pp. III V. L. 10 Esc. 6. "y así otras veces;" 4 V. L. 16 Esc. 6; 53 V. L. 6 Esc. 6.

in the treatment of tonic ě, ō, but also—and with equal inconsistency—diphthongization of ě, ō even where it is not found in Castilian, viz. before palatals. Cf. Gessner, D. Leonesische p. 5; Munthe, Anteckn. p. 29; Menéndez Pidal, Dial. leon. p. 18. The same “unsichere sprachgefühl” manifests itself in *mocho* etc. Under the circumstances we may safely seek the authors of *fuerna* etc. in Leon-Asturias, respectively Navarre-Aragon.

K. PIETSCH

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

BIOLOGICAL ANALOGY IN LITERARY CRITICISM

II

THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE AND THE SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST

In the special preface written by Ferdinand Brunetière for the English edition of his *Manuel de l'histoire de la littérature française* the late French critic applies the theory of evolution to the history of literature in the following words:

A given variety of literature, the English drama of the sixteenth century, or the French comedy of the seventeenth century, or the English novel of the eighteenth century is in process of development, slowly organizing itself, under the double influence of the interior and exterior environment. The movement is slow and the differentiation almost insensible. Suddenly and without its being possible to give the reason, a Shakspeare, a Molière, or a Richardson appears, and forthwith not only is the variety modified but new species have come into being: psychological drama, the comedy of character, the novel of manners. The superior adaptability and power of survival of the new species are at once recognized and proved indeed in practice. It is vain that the older species attempt to struggle, their fate is sealed in advance. The successors of Richardson, Molière and Shakspeare copy these unattainable models until, their fecundity being exhausted—and by their fecundity I mean their aptitude for struggling with kindred and rival species—the imitation is changed into a routine which becomes a source of weakness, impoverishment and death to the species.

In this concise formulation—too concise to touch anything deeper than the surface phenomena of literary change—Brunetière does find a place for the individual. He does not succeed, however, in showing just what part the individual consciousness plays in variation, and as he sticks closely to biological terms the parallelisms observed are apparent rather than real. Nowhere does he descend to the real psychological nature of the process involved, and so fails to grasp clearly the genetic relation between all the factors observed. Just as little do his concluding sentences give an adequate explanation of the survival of species in litera-

ture. An analysis of the actual process by virtue of which literary forms survive until supplanted by others will show that their perpetuation depends upon psychological and not biological conditions. Competition between rival species, as in the animal world, there cannot be, and it would be better to omit the word "struggle" altogether from this phase of the problem. However much its use may seem justified from an external point of view, this word fails utterly to give adequate conception of what is really involved. The fitness of literary forms to survive is not a fitness for struggle for itself but a fitness for assimilation and reproductive imitation on the part of others. A literary species does not perish because it has been crowded out by rival species, but because it has lost its utility for the society upon which its life depends. Even at that, certain individual representatives of a given species may outlive the type of which they formed the most conspicuous members. But at the risk of again being tedious we must begin at the beginning.

Natural selection in biology depends essentially upon two factors: the geometric ratio at which a species of plants or animals, if unchecked, will multiply, and the limited food supply in a given environment. The advantage which one species or one individual has over another in the struggle for existence arises from some variation which enables that species or individual to obtain a greater amount of food. Whether the variation in question arose by slow and insensible differences in a fixed direction over a long period of time, as Darwin thought, or whether it came into existence suddenly as one of many variations in several different directions, according to the theory of De Vries, makes no difference. Its perpetuation as the dominant characteristic of the species would depend on its utility to the species itself in the competition with rival species. Stress must be laid on the point here that it is of utility to the species itself. The influence of a variation on the environment is a different question—for the mutual relation, the give-and-take between biological species and their environment, does not exist in any sense analogous to that found in the institutions which form the tissue of human society.

If the factors involved here bear any analogy to the propagation and variation of species in literature, it can only be in relation to those gifted individuals in society through whom literary species are perpetuated and modified. In a former paragraph we tried to define the part played by the individual consciousness in the perpetuation and variation of literary forms. We insisted upon the fact that this consciousness was the medium in which and through which all changes took place. Variation whether definite or indefinite was found to depend in some degree upon the aesthetic inventive power of the individual producer. In like manner the amount of literature produced and the number of variations taking place at any given period must depend directly on the the number of individuals producing it, multiplied by their average productive power. If this be granted, then the question that emerges is: are there any grounds for assuming that a struggle for existence between literary species could arise at any given time, from the fact that the amount of literature or the number of variations produced is greater than the assimilating power, i. e., the consumption of the society for which it is produced? Without touching upon the real nature of literary propagation here we may at once answer this question in the negative.

The fact that man in his social relations, to a certain extent, transcends mere biological law has long been recognized by anthropologists and sociologists. By virtue or by defect of social relations based on intelligent co-operation there is no struggle for existence, no survival of the fittest in human society.

The lack of any selection, natural or artificial, in the propagation of the human species has led to the condition characterized as "panmixia" by Weissmann. As only the notoriously unfit—the criminal and the insane—are socially suppressed, the result may often be the increase of those classes in society which are less desirable. This state of affairs has in our day not escaped the critical eye of Bernard Shaw, as all familiar with his *Superman* know. But the point to be emphasized is that there is no tendency to perpetuate literary talent or genius in human society in the same sense as useful variations would be perpetuated in a biological species by virtue of the advantage which such varia-

tions would give one species over another in the struggle for existence. This makes the emergence of literary talent or genius, from the biological point of view, to all intents a matter of chance. At any rate it is a quantity incalculable from any data which biological evolution affords.

The biometricians, so far as we are aware, have not as yet gathered any statistics to show the ratio of the number of literary talents to the population in a given society. It is a problem beset with great difficulties, as there would probably be little consensus of opinion in regard to the individuals to be included in the group of eminent talents. In any case, from a scientific point of view it will probably be a good while before enough reliable statistics can be collected to show whether the ratio is variable or constant. Judged simply in the light of history, with regard to actual achievement, the amount of productive literary talent would seem to be a variable quantity. We know that real poetic geniuses do not crowd each other. The nation that produces one every four centuries may consider itself fortunate. But neither the perpetuation nor the variation of literary forms depends solely on the geniuses. In the long run civilization probably owes as much to its poets of the second class. These are much more numerous and are quite as likely to introduce variations which will prove of utility to society, though history would seem to prove that the number of these varies greatly at different times.

The Elizabethan age records a longer list of eminent dramatists than any period in the history of English literature before or since. The nineteenth century can make a similar boast for its novelists. During the last quarter of the eighteenth century the Weimar court gathered the greatest array of eminent poets together that Germany has ever known. At first sight, therefore, it would seem justifiable to assume that productive literary talent is a very variable quantity. But the whole problem is complicated by the fact that some ages are much more favorable to actual production than others. At some periods the ideas, convictions, deeds, events, personalities, etc., which form the materials available for literary production and variation are found in great abundance. At other times they are comparatively meager. It follows, there-

fore, that the amount of actual achievement at any time depends greatly upon the amount of opportunity which the talent may be said to enjoy.

This question: how much the making of history depends upon great men and how much must be attributed to opportunity, has been discussed recently by James Bryce.¹ The eminent English historian takes the view advocated in the "hero worship" of Carlyle. He denies that the force of environment and circumstance always suffices to produce the man with constructive talent enough to solve the problems presented. He makes historical achievement depend entirely upon the presence of the inventive power required and thus reduces the history of the world to a tissue of biographies. In our terms literary production would then depend wholly upon biological heredity. But we must raise the question whether the converse of this proposition is not equally true. If the hour may strike long before the emergence of the man, may not available talent be at hand without the materials with which to construct? We readily grant that the political disintegration of Germany might have continued until the present day but for Bismarck. The foundation for Prussian hegemony had been laid since the days of Frederick the Great, the passionate desire of the German people for unification as well as the imperious demands of their commercial interests for uniform regulation, had existed since the uprising against Napoleon. But until Bismarck came upon the stage, no statesman had appeared with constructive talent enough to unite these elements into a new political institution: the German Empire. Darwin published his *Origin of Species* in 1859 and his fundamental idea rapidly pervaded all branches of thought. But still almost a generation passed before this idea found expression in literature. New material was available but the inventive power requisite to combine it with traditional forms was lacking. Today under the influence of Ibsen, Zola, Hauptmann, Sudermann, and Bernard Shaw this new combination bids fair to become a transforming force marking an epoch in the history of European letters.

Conversely the existence of talent without the proper oppor-

¹In the *Youth's Companion*, October 31, 1907, and *Pall Mall Magazine*, December, 1907.

tunity to exploit itself seems equally certain. The "village Hampdens, the mute inglorious Miltons and the guiltless Cromwells" do not exist in poetry alone. In his famous review of German literature preceding his time, Goethe¹ long ago pointed out that for a century preceding Lessing there had been no lack of poetic talent in Germany. What the literature really needed was "content," as he expressed it. In other words, national literary traditions as well as available materials to be gathered directly by observation from the environment were both lacking. Individuals with constructive imagination sufficient to produce works which might have formed permanent accessions to the literature there were, but the social environment effectually prevented noble achievement. A high artistic form was never united to a significant content until the days of Lessing. No student of German literature, familiar with the plays of Gryphius, can doubt that here was a dramatic talent which under more favorable circumstances would have made a name in the annals of letters. Everywhere in his writings we find a power for fine observation, a knowledge of human passion, a command of language, with occasional flashes of genius almost, which could not have failed to produce dramas of a high order if he had had any worthy dramatic tradition upon which to lean and an environment furnishing materials worthy of his pen. But in a country intellectually and morally, as well as politically and commercially blighted by a long war, with a public composed of a corrupt and vicious aristocracy on the one hand and of brutalized subjects on the other, confined to a petty round of official duties onerous with ceremony and red-tape, with no political or intellectual horizon beyond the narrow confines of a duodecimo principality, it is little wonder that his talent was squandered on the lurid and blood-curdling spectacles which form the bulk of his tragedies. The same holds true of Günther. In his lyrics there is the ring of emotional sincerity, the simplicity and directness of expression and much of the lilt which go to make up the genuine lyric poet, but he frittered away his talent on subjects too trivial to challenge attention. A song of his may be found occasionally in the "Kommersbücher" but his produc-

¹ *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, Book VII.

tions as a whole form no integral part of German literature. We must conclude, therefore, that the power of aesthetic invention alone is not sufficient to produce literature. Whether constructive imagination in latent form may be a constant quantity, we cannot tell. But for actual production the circumstances must likewise be favorable. For high achievement the right man must be in the right place at the right time. In evolutionary terms the biological heredity of some individual must conform to his social heredity, if permanent results are to be brought forth. To achieve the naturalistic drama the peculiar temperament of a Hauptmann must concur with a scientific age, heavy with social conflict. By such conformities, and by such conformities alone, is history made. From such a point of view some light is cast on the discrepancy existing between the constant and indefinite variation in the ego and the definite or mutating variation in the product mentioned in a previous paragraph. The actual amount of variation achieved by a given talent depends largely on the presence or the absence of the materials requisite for new constructions. These materials are factors which he cannot create but must find ready to his hand. They are furnished by his social heredity, and upon this factor will depend also the amount as well as the permanency of the variation he can hope to achieve. At all events, the variations that prove of the greatest utility do not necessarily always come from the hand of genius.

Whether aesthetic inventive talent be a constant or variable quantity, it follows from the foregoing that the coincidences or concurrences of talent and opportunity are not necessarily constant. The scientific data necessary for the demonstration of this statement do not exist, but the records of human history all go to show that one age is much more prolific than another in the production of works which after generations care to assimilate and imitate. In the history of German drama the last ten years of Schiller's life produced more really great dramas than the two following generations of effort on the part of the Romanticists. Following the example of his predecessor, Lessing, Schiller assimilated and imitated the best dramatic works which the Renaissance had produced in Europe. Without any national foundations, he

succeeded in uniting at least a significant content with high artistic form, and for three generations almost his dramas were the dominant force on the German stage. His cosmopolitan basis was the only basis possible in Germany at that time. But tired of traditional conventionalities, eager for the rehabilitation of individual emotion and finding no better national foundations than Schiller had found before them, the Romanticists simply dissipated an abundance of talent in a vain search for worthy materials. They harked back to the Middle Ages and borrowed the picturesque trappings of an extinct Catholicism, they attempted to revive the fate-tragedy of the Greeks, they penetrated to the Orient and tried to imbibe its mysticism, they soared to the supernatural and reveled in the ideal, but only in exceptional cases did they succeed in attaining artistic truth and reality. The number of literary works that live, form, in any age, only a small fraction of the total number produced. But the fraction here compared with the amount of talent expended and the number of works written is surprisingly small.

Granting, then, that the actual literary output varies greatly at different periods, there is still no reason to assume that this output ever exceeds the assimilating capacity of the public. Indeed, to a certain extent it would seem to be a matter of demand and supply. A successful play can be continued as long as it will draw a house. The means of multiplying copies of a poem or novel being mechanical, the size of an edition can be regulated according to the sale. To be sure this applies mainly to the immediate or temporary success of a work, while novelty still exerts its charm. It forms no basis upon which to calculate the chances of survival or non-survival. The very fact that the supply can be regulated to meet the demand makes it practically a negligible factor, as far as competition with rival works is concerned. But there is another reason for assuming that the actual output never exceeds the assimilating power of a given society. This is the versatile and elastic character of the assimilating process itself. That there must be a limit to this psychological power seems clear, and yet the vast amount of literature that is published and read in these days of "best sellers" would almost seem to point to the opposite

conclusion. The fact, however, that the process of assimilation and enjoyment is psychological renders the application of biological analogy well nigh useless. In the animal world, rival species compete for food. As the supply is limited, the consumption of a given quantity by one species means just so much less for the rival species. Moreover, the failure of the food supply of the proper kind often forces an animal to resort to the other kinds. A carnivorous animal will eat vegetables rather than starve. It is governed first and last by the law of self-preservation. No such necessity obtains in the intellectual world. If all the vaudeville shows in New York were suddenly abolished the public that patronizes them would not clamor for comedy of character or high tragedy. If an individual cannot procure the literature that suits his taste he is not forced to read other works. Owing to the versatility of his mental endowment he may go without. No species of literature, or of amusement either, ever becomes necessary for intellectual sustenance in the sense that food is for life. As a matter of fact, a whole nation can get along for a good while without much art or literature. Witness the Romans.

In the realm of letters different species can compete only for assimilation by the public. But the same public will assimilate and enjoy the most diverse literary products. To be an admirer of Schiller does not mean necessarily that one cannot enjoy Hauptmann. The assimilation of Shakspeare by a given society does not destroy that society's power of assimilation for Bernard Shaw. Both can exist side by side, and as long as the public recognizes some utility in each, no real competition or struggle in the biological sense can arise. Furthermore, there is reason to suppose that society's assimilating power grows not only with the increase of population but much more so as the result of education, which is, after all, only the discipline of this same assimilating power. The circulation attained by some popular novels in our day simply dwarfs the editions of Scott or of Dickens put forth by publishers two generations ago. As the ratio of increased circulation exceeds the ratio of increase of population, some factor has entered in to cause the increased demand for literary works. This factor must be education, which is much more universal than

formerly. At any rate it seems fair to assume that the assimilating power of civilized society is greatly on the increase and is more than keeping pace with increase of production. The rapid growth of the theaters in this country recently points in the same direction.

From the view-point of actual literary production, then, no data warrant the assumption that a struggle for existence between different species can arise. If society's capacity to assimilate has always proved equal to its productive power then the cause of failure to survive on the part of a literary work or the cause of one literary species' supplanting another must be sought elsewhere. But before considering literary works themselves as mere products and what it is that causes their survival, one or two observations will be in order.

A great drama or a great novel may be said to live or survive in two senses. In its active or productive sense a given variation demonstrates its fitness for reproductive imitation on the part of others. In its passive or assimilative aspect, the same variation may cease to inspire the production of other works of the same type but still live on as part of the literary heredity of the race, to be studied and enjoyed by succeeding generations. Indeed we may go still farther here and assert that some of the most monumental poetic achievements are utterly unfit for imitation, but have become none the less an integral part of the national consciousness. The life of a literary species depends, of course, upon the fitness of a variation to serve as the prototype after which other works of the same kind shall be fashioned. It is this aspect which Brunetière has in mind when he speaks of a species losing its fecundity. He explains this term to mean the aptitude of a type for struggling with kindred and rival species, and asserts that through it, reproductive imitation is changed into a routine which becomes a source of weakness, impoverishment, and death. We would prefer to explain the word "fecundity" as the ability to inspire the production of other works of the same type and make this ability depend directly upon the utility which society finds in a given variation. It follows logically from this that imitation need not necessarily be changed into a routine. On the contrary,

the variation itself may be improved upon by reproductive imitators, as Shakspeare elaborated and perfected the type set by Marlowe, or as Schiller improved upon the drama of Lessing. That depends on the powers of assimilation and aesthetic invention found in the imitators. We are inclined to think that the works of Sudermann are improvements over the works of Hauptmann. That is to say, they contain more of the artistic truth and reality which the coming generation will verify and imitate. The specimens of heroic tragedy produced by Stephen Phillips or Percy Mackaye are, as far as we can see, in no way inferior to those Sheridan Knowles, for example, put forth half a century ago. Yet the latter were a success upon the stage while the former have proved mostly failures. What really has taken place is a change, for some reason or other, in society's views of what constitutes artistic truth and reality. In Knowles' day the belief in the superiority of the individual will over nature and society was supreme. Today, as the result of a scientific conception of society and of the social conflict between the different classes, Knowles' attempt to emphasize the individualistic element seems exaggerated and unreal. As long as the public, patient and long-suffering as it is known to be, sees its own views of life reflected upon the stage, it will stand and pay for a vast deal of mere imitation, as the numberless plays "put together with paste and shears" amply prove. But if this public finds itself at odds with the view of life as presented, then the decline of interest resulting means weakness, impoverishment, and death to the species. Then only the best specimens of the works embodying the discarded view of life will live on as monuments of a past age.

But even in its specific life, literature shows marked divergence in one point from its biological analogue. In the animal world one generation must transmit the specific characters received from the preceding to the one that follows. In literature, the works of some one writer are usually recognized as "unattainable models," and from this prototype the materials, structure, emotions, etc., can be borrowed directly by imitators without the intervention of any connecting link. To use one of Brunetière's examples, Richardson's works may serve as the model for the novel of manners

for an indefinite period of time and every member of this literary species may derive its specific characters from Richardson and not from Richardson's imitators. When this prototype has ceased to be imitated longer, then the species has died out, its utility has been lost, owing to some change in the social environment itself.

On the other hand, as we have already observed, individual members of a given species may outlive the utility of the species itself and in a certain sense enjoy immortality. This is the passive or assimilative phase of the life of literature. It has to do with the relation of a work to society, a subject which was first touched upon by Wilhelm Scherer in his lectures on *Poetics*. Certain works recognized as the great masterpieces of their kind live and continue to be assimilated by society long after the species to which they belong has died out. The Homeric epic, for example, has long ceased to be a productive type, but yet the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have become a part of the literary inheritance of all civilized nations. Up to 1870 a study of these masterpieces formed a conspicuous part in the training of every educated man, and through translations they exerted a wide influence on the general reading public. In like manner Shakspeare among English-speaking peoples and Schiller in Germany will for a long time to come be read and studied as much as ever, as the great masterpieces of the heroic tragedy of character. But the tragedy of psychological individualization can hardly be said to be a productive type any longer. Rostand was its last representative in France, the naturalistic drama is practically the only productive species in Germany today, and the efforts of Stephen Phillips and of Percy Mackaye here in America to revive the heroic drama have done little more than galvanize it into a semblance of life. But this assimilation by the public is the only life that some monumental poems ever enjoy. Poems like Dante's *Divine Comedy* or Goethe's *Faust* are totally unfit for reproductive imitation. The conjunction of constructive power and favorable circumstances to which they owe their origin probably never occurs more than once in the history of any people. Such works are the real literary "hybrids," not Latin literature as Symonds thought. The latter was a Greek exotic simply, which never flourished vigorously under

Roman cultivation. These "hybrids" naturally do not form the beginnings of a new species, but they do form a large factor in the civilization of the nation by which they are produced. They epitomize the culture and thought of a whole epoch and stand forth like colossal monuments to mark the turning-points in the history of the race. Their influence permeates not only the nation from which they sprang but becomes in time a part of the social heredity of all civilized nations. It should be observed, in conclusion, that this passive or assimilative aspect of survival in letters has nothing corresponding to it in biology. It is simply the result of that psychological process by which mental products can be stored up in symbolic form and handed down from generation to generation. Nevertheless, this very process, as Brunetière has already pointed out, is the most important factor not only in literary production but also in education. But it is time now to consider the real cause of survival, decay, and death in literary forms.

As we have already stated more than once, it is its utility to society which causes a literary variation to be perpetuated. In other words, a new literary form must be such as society will find good mentally to assimilate and add to its store of experiences. By virtue of such assimilation and of such assimilation only is the perpetuation of a given species possible. Reproductive talents will not imitate a work which has proved a failure. Fitness for reproductive imitation will depend directly on the fitness for social assimilation. In the last analysis, therefore, the survival or death of a variation depends upon the judgment of the society for which it was produced. The word, "society," of course, is to be taken here in its large sense, as including producers and critics with their diverse opinions as well as mere readers or lay members. This position is the logical sequence of our conception of literature as one of the means by which the ego conveys the emotional values of human life to other egos. Literature is a conscious function of society, for society, and by society. From a scientific point of view, to talk of art for art's sake is to talk nonsense. By the utility of a literary variation to society is meant, therefore, the possibility of such variation being verified as true and real and consequently assimilated by the consciousness of the egos com-

posing society. By virtue of such verification and assimilation certain emotions designated as pleasurable arise in human consciousness, and pleasurable emotions according to the psychologists are those which make for the life both of the individual and of society. To go farther and ask why it is that the human ego finds pleasure in assimilating artificial representations of human life, representations of what in reality is often exceedingly painful, is the business of the psychologist. As a working hypothesis we are content to regard it with Schiller and Karl Groos as the result of the play-instinct, of the pleasure of make-believe common to both animals and man. The significant point for us, however, is the fact that in order to survive, a new literary form must be assimilated by society, must demonstrate its utility by expressing better that society's view of what is real and true in life. Josiah Royce tells us that society recognizes as true that which guides it to more experience of the kind that it desires. In this sense, then, a literary variation to survive must furnish society more of such experience than it has previously enjoyed. In other words, must approximate more closely to society's ideal of truth and reality. Put sociologically the individualistic variation of today must become the collectivistic generalization of tomorrow. If it does not, then the new form is to all intents and purposes dead-born. This process by which the particularization of some individual is made the common property of society is the only way in which literature can be said to survive, the only sense in which it can develop. The new generalization will, in its turn, form the basis for other variations by other individuals, and so on.

If the life of a literary species depends upon society's willingness to assimilate it, then the decay and death of a literary type must follow because it has lost its utility for society. The decay and death of a literary form is not the consequence of the rise of other forms. The rise of new forms generally, but not necessarily, accompanies the decadence of old ones. But the decadence of old species may with more truth be attributed to the same cause as the rise of new ones. The consciousness that the old forms no longer express the truth and reality of life as society now sees it, results alike in the decadence of interest in the old as well as in the

attempt to invent new. And this change in the value which society sets at different times upon the same variation is the result of transformations which have been brought about in most cases by forces at work in realms of thought extrinsic to literature proper. The idea of free will and individual moral responsibility which formed the transforming unit in the drama of psychological individualization was established in England as the result of a fierce theological and political conflict. The dominant characteristic of the naturalistic drama owes its origin to researches in science fortified by the influence of social conflict. In these days of gigantic organizations both of capital and of labor, when the cry has gone forth that the individual must sacrifice his own interests for the good of the whole, the consciousness that man is not the architect of his own fortune in the sense that Shakspeare and Schiller conceived him has been brought home to society often as a very painful reality. These two forces, the scientific and the social, have united to bring about a changed conception of the individual's relation to society. This new conception has found expression in literature and appeals to society as nearer the truth and the reality than the old individualistic conception. The old species has decayed because it has lost its utility. It has lost its utility because society has changed its interpretation of human life, and society has changed its interpretation of human life with its ethical and emotional values not because literature has changed, but because other social forces with which literature has not been directly concerned have been slowly at work transforming man's conception of his place in the universe. All phases of psychic and social life interpenetrate each other, but changes in art are the results, not the causes, of changes elsewhere. Literature simply must vary as the result of changes in the other activities. When in the course of human events a transvaluation of social values, to use Nietzsche's phrase, has taken place, then literature and art as well must either seek to embody these new values or must decay and die.

If this explanation be correct it follows that any social institution may lose its utility without being either crowded out by a rival species or supplanted by something better. For a century

and a half after the Peace of Westphalia the Holy Roman Empire continued to exist, as a ridiculous political anachronism, although people were conscious of its uselessness as a bond of national unity. Voltaire wittily remarked that it was not holy, nor Roman, nor an empire. It was only domestic troubles of their own which prevented neighboring powers from making the German states the prey of aggression. Even after the useless political carcass was buried beneath the conquests of Napoleon, the German people had to wait for full two generations before an adequate substitute could be devised to put into its place. The same holds true of species in literature. Society may become conscious that a given type is losing its utility long before it is supplanted by something truer to society's conception of reality.

From the moment that the yearning of the German people for unification became a concrete reality in the form of the German Empire, the public recognized that the ideals held up in Schiller's dramas had little to teach them. His cosmopolitan idealism furnished no adequate foundation upon which to realize national ideals, his conception of human liberty provided no basis for the solution of social and economic problems among a people where the barriers between the different classes were too rigid to permit of social osmosis. The new political order must needs inculcate the conception of duty, i. e., what each individual owed to others. As the result the ideal of the German nation has become social justice, not human liberty in the cosmopolitan sense taught by the eighteenth century. The effort of Hermann Grimm in the early eighties to make Goethe's works the foundation of national culture shows clearly that Schiller was losing ground long before the problem play emerged. But Goethe's ideal of self-realization proved of little avail. Germany's greatest poetic genius unquestionably anticipated the course of nineteenth-century thought and culture. He embodied its scientific spirit and its historical method, he manifested its preference for characterization in contrast to action and plot, he uttered some of the wisest judgments on art and human conduct that have ever been uttered, he achieved some of the greatest poetic achievements that have ever been achieved, but after all it was the "*suffering human race*" and not the Ger-

man people struggling with political and social problems that he took, to "read each wound and weakness clear." When the naturalistic drama did come, it did, in spite of all its shortcomings, perform at least one service—it united literature and life. If poetry in dealing with acute social problems wallowed in the mire, it at least derived new strength and vigor from its contact with the earth, like the giant Antaeus of old. It is the naturalistic drama, not the works of Goethe or of Schiller, which has made the stage in Germany a powerful factor in national culture. Competent critics tell us that the German theater today, as a social institution, occupies a place in the national consciousness which it has occupied only once before in the history of the human race, namely, at the time when Greek tragedy was in flower. This drama has taught the German people that the stage has a higher mission to fulfil than to furnish a short hour's amusement for the satiated and the idle. This is the lesson which the American public must learn if the great American drama, whose advent has been recently heralded, is ever to become a reality.

But a poetic species, owing to changed social environment, or to changed social heredity, may perish without being supplanted by anything different. It is generally conceded at the present time that Milton's *Paradise Lost* does not hold the place in public esteem that it once held. Not only has the biblical epic died out as a species, but Milton's great masterpiece is no longer studied as it once was. It has ceased to be a living influence in the thought and feeling of men, it has lost its social utility and has become the monument of a bygone age. If we ask what rival literary species have forced it to succumb in the struggle for existence, we are at a total loss for a reply. If we seek for the poetic species which has supplanted it in popular favor, we seek in vain. The only rational explanation of the biblical epic's loss of fecundity and its consequent decay and death is to be found in the changed attitude of society toward religion.

Milton's great epic was the offspring of an age of militant theology. Society accepted the Bible as the inspired Word of God. The truth of Divine Revelation was unquestioned. The problem which agitated men's souls was the true meaning of the

Scripture and the formulation of its teachings into some logical system of doctrine. The fierce conflicts that ensued were all between systems professing to rest on the only true and logical interpretation of Divine Revelation. Today the battle is no longer being waged between the different creeds of Christendom but between Divine Revelation and science, between faith and knowledge. Modern science has not only undermined the foundation of inspiration but the historical method itself has visibly transformed the method of biblical interpretation. The various books of the Bible no longer stand on the same plane of equality. The discovery of the sources from which some of them were drawn and the interpretation of their teachings in the light of the conditions which gave them birth has materially altered the values which the church as a whole puts upon them. That part of society which forms the Christian church manifests little interest in disputes over dogma and creed. The religious center of gravity has shifted from speculations about the life to come to amelioration of the life here. On all sides the cry is heard that the church is a social institution. The mission of the church as a social healer has almost overshadowed its mission as the custodian of a system of revealed truth. It cannot be said that men no longer are interested in religious questions. They are. But they are interested in the influence which the latest generalizations in science will exert on traditional beliefs, in the new constructions which the latest historical discoveries will force upon traditional interpretations, or in the part which the church, as an organization, is to play in the future development of society.

Under such circumstances it is not surprising that a poem like Milton's *Paradise Lost* fails to arouse interest. To many minds the legends of the war between the angels in Heaven as well as the account of the Fall have become myths, with little significance for real religion. To many more the Calvinistic basis of Milton's whole theology is no longer a living issue. As a consequence the great biblical epic has lost its utility as an embodiment of religious truth and reality. The species itself has not only long since died out but its best representative exerts but a small influence in an age whose whole bent is for demonstrable facts. It has per-

ished because it is no longer assimilated by society; it has left no successor, so far as we can see, and it has not been crowded to the wall by any rival poetic species, but has perished only because the whole religious attitude of society has been transformed by forces of which literature proper forms no part.

The fate that has befallen the biblical epic naturally raises the question how far the content and how far the form are responsible for the survival of a literary species. In other words, does the life of a given type depend more on fitness of content or fitness of form? This word is to be taken here in its narrower sense as embracing mere aesthetic qualities in contrast to the ideas or social issues which the form may be said to embody. In the light of what has been said the only logical inference is that the specific life of literature depends upon content more than upon form. This follows not only from the fact that the transforming units in literary variation are ideas drawn from other spheres of intellectual life, and not ideas evolved in the course of literary development itself. But it may be asserted also that society's understanding of content is much more highly developed than its appreciation of form. The numberless plays which are nothing but crude copies of some successful prototype and which form the staple of the English and American stage today prove this. A successful novel always brings in its wake a train of weaker imitations which are read and assimilated until the charm of novelty has spent its force. Milton's *Paradise Lost* bears witness to the same fact. So far as form is concerned this biblical epic unquestionably contains great poetry. The broad and deep flow of its diction, the stately tread of its measures, its sustained power of imagination, its aptness of simile and metaphor, all combine to produce those effects known as the vast, the exalted, and the sublime, in a manner which has not been equaled in English poetry. But all its nobility and fitness of style have not saved the species from death nor this masterpiece itself from desuetude. Without content which appeals to society as a living issue, a species of poetry will not long endure. With such a content a species may exert a wide and transforming influence without paying much attention to form, as the naturalistic movement seems to show.

What form does accomplish is this. It insures the existence of individual works in the passive or assimilative sense already spoken of. Such works not only embody the living issues of the time in which they were produced but they embody them in the artistic form which society recognizes as of the greatest excellence. A single generation may fail to appreciate their artistic merits. Even Shakspeare suffered an eclipse during the age of Queen Anne. But in the long run society chooses as the masterpieces of a species those works which represent the highest degree of artistic perfection. These works it cherishes and studies as the monuments which mark an epoch in thought as well as in artistic workmanship. These works are handed down from generation to generation and form the tissue of tradition upon which the literary production of any age must build. They recapitulate the literary development of the race or nation and from them each succeeding generation of writers can assimilate the best that the race has achieved in the past, and make his attempt to adapt it to the thought of his time. In like manner these works are the great literary educators of society. How far the recapitulation theory holds true in biology is a disputed question. But that education simply recapitulates—to be sure only in fragmentary fashion in the case of each individual—the mental and artistic development of the race there can be but little doubt. The great monuments of the past become either consciously or unconsciously the basis for literary taste.

To some readers doubtless the foregoing pages will seem like a disquisition in the demonstration of the obvious. To such a charge we are willing to plead guilty, but add in extenuation that it is just this *obvious* which the biological theory of literary development seems to obscure, or at least not to take into consideration. We have no quarrel with the theory of evolution, we are rather convinced that it is about the only theory which gives any promise of bringing order out of the chaos of aesthetic, biographical, and historical monographs, which form the bulk of critical production today. We shall not be easily persuaded that this theory, when applied in its psychological form with due recognition of the social nature of literature, has not very decided advantages. If it

cannot claim to solve all the problems involved, it at least formulates all the factors entering into the variation, perpetuation, and life of literature into something like their genetic relationship. Only upon some such genetic basis can we hope to adjust the discrepancies and antagonisms that have arisen from the conflicting points of view assumed by the aesthetic, the biographical, and historical methods of literary study. Furthermore, from the practical point of view, an evolutionary theory in psychological form furnishes a simple principle according to which the ever-growing mass of literary data may be classified and arranged into a system approximating the actual process of literary development itself. With such a principle in mind, the relative importance of individual inventive power, of social heredity, and of the influence on society in a given case can be formulated in due proportion. Upon such a foundation something like permanent critical judgments may be built up and some basis obtained for making the study of literature a much more potent factor in education than it has ever been.

We are not blind to the difficulties in the way of the application of such a theory. It will demand a vast array of learning, greater perhaps than any one man will ever possess. In fact it may be freely conceded that all the materials for the construction of such a system are by no means at hand. What is called the history of culture in the broad sense has been written as yet only for one people, the Greek. The investigator in the history of the literature of any nation will doubtless meet with great lacunae in the history of those realms of thought upon which literature draws for its materials. Some of these lacunae may never be filled, a fact which renders the application of any theory difficult. But the magnitude of the difficulty is no good reason for wandering forever amid the chaos of special investigation. Any attempt to reach the firm ground of scientific classification is better than floundering in the quicksand of subjective impressionism.

We are also aware that there is great objection among certain aesthetic critics to any scientific method of criticism. The very hint of strict definition and logical classification causes consternation among them comparable only to the sudden appearance of a

mouse in a class-room of girls. To such the fact must be pointed out that all the progress which literary criticism either as a science or an art has made, has been due to men of logical minds, men whose powers of aesthetic appreciation have been directed and controlled by logical intelligence. The very founder of all criticism, Aristotle, was a man of definitions and classifications if ever there was one. The next landmark in the history of criticism was the work of Lessing. His lack of artistic feeling was notorious, for he accepted nothing in criticism or in anything else which could not justify itself before the bar of eighteenth-century rationalism. Goethe was one of the greatest critics that ever lived. We have Matthew Arnold's word for that. But Goethe was the great exponent of the historical method. His judgments have proved illuminating and enduring because they were all based on inferences from established historical facts. Taine's famous formulation was but the analogue of the principle which Cuvier had applied to the classification of plants. Sainte-Beuve developed no theory, but his valuable inductions rest upon patient observation of countless details, and he at least hoped that literary criticism might become a science. The best that Matthew Arnold ever knew and propagated in criticism he learned from Sainte-Beuve. Finally, Brunetière boldly attempted to make the theory of biological evolution the basis for a criticism which should represent the development of letters as it really is. Criticism, therefore, has not suffered from trying to be scientific. In every case it has really gained. Contemporary literature is being transformed by elements drawn from modern science. Let literary criticism strive to do no less.

JOHN PRESTON HOSKINS

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *PIERS PLOWMAN*

Second only to the good fortune of having Mr. Jusserand as an ally in my investigation of the *Piers the Plowman* poems is that of having him as an opponent. When he and I first discussed my views in conversation some three years ago I cherished the hope that even the brief expository sketch of them in the *Cambridge Hist. of Engl. Lit.* might induce him to adopt the theory as to authorship which a careful study of the poems in many aspects had caused me to form. He had long ago recognized many of the difficulties presented by the poems and had explained them by a highly ingenious and poetical conception of a very complex and self-contradictory personality for the author. It seemed to me a result that might be hoped as well as desired that the additional difficulties disclosed by my discussion should lead him to recognize, as I had felt obliged to do, that the right solution of the problems of the poems lay in their multiple authorship. But this was not to be. My presentation of my views, unpolemical as I tried to make it, has served only to confirm his previous views, and convince him more strongly than ever of their validity. But disappointed as I am of my cherished hope, I have the satisfaction—a real satisfaction to one who is only desirous that we shall reach the truth in this inquiry—of knowing that if my views can support the vigorous and skilful attack made by Mr. Jusserand, no doubt as to their truth can remain in the mind of anyone.

Mr. Jusserand's discussion is, as all who are familiar with his work knew it would be, a masterpiece of persuasive eloquence. In addition to this, the special issues are met and discussed in the middle part of his paper with a dexterity that must have been convincing to every reader who contented himself with being a passive reader only and gave no active personal investigation to the evidence and arguments adduced. Moreover, the whole order and arrangement of parts is skilfully devised to

break such force as the arguments of the adversary may have when properly massed and valued.

How then is this formidable attack to be met? It would seem the part of wisdom to avoid the order and method of discussion chosen by one's opponent, but I shall, in replying to Mr. Jusserand, undertake no detours, execute no flank movements, but, as nearly as I can, meet his onset at every point and discuss the question in the order chosen by him. I shall do this, because I am confident of the truth and strength of my position and because the reader will thus most easily assure himself that the attack really has been met successfully at every point and that the success is not a success of dialectical dexterity, but of sound reasoning. Let us then proceed to the discussion of Mr. Jusserand's arguments in the order in which he has developed them.

I

First, he begins with a celebration of the merits of the *Piers Plowman* poems as, "next to the *Canterbury Tales*, the greatest literary work produced by England during the Middle Ages," accents the unique democracy of *Piers the Plowman* and contrasts its vivid interest in internal reforms with the singular indifference of Chaucer to such matters and his singular lack of national feeling. With the praise of the poems I am in most thorough and hearty accord; indeed, as I have elsewhere said, I regard them as having even greater merits and greater significance than has hitherto been allowed. In addition to the remarkable poetic eloquence of the author of the B text, which has always been recognized, I recognize a clearness of vision and a capacity for artistic and orderly development of ideas on the part of the author of the first part of the A text, which had, previous to my first article on the subject, been generally overlooked. And I maintain that the social and political significance of the work of several men of notable intellectual power, and of ideas and aims of the same general tendency (notwithstanding individual differences), is far greater than that of a solitary, though powerful voice. With the implied criticism of Chaucer—as it has no bearing upon the subject under discussion—I will

not deal here, but may return to it another day, to point out that Alain Chartier, in giving his reasons for not admitting political discussion to his poetry but reserving it for prose, may possibly furnish a clue to Chaucer's supposed indifference.

Great, however, as is the significance of *Piers the Plowman*, it seems to me not to possess precisely the traits ascribed to it by Mr. Jusserand. It is undoubtedly "thoroughly English," but to say that "of foreign influences on it there are but the faintest traces" seems to me an exaggeration. It is on the contrary full of evidences of influences from both French and Latin literature, most of which, to be sure, have been overlooked. And when, in order to establish unity of authorship for the poems, Mr. Jusserand represents them as containing absolutely unique democratic ideas, he seems to me to be going a little too far. "The equivalent of such a line," says he, "as the following one on the power of king, nobles and commons:

Knyghthood hym ladde,
Might of the comunes made hym to regne,

can be found nowhere in the whole range of mediaeval literature; it has but one real equivalent (inaccessible then to the public)—the Rolls of Parliament" (p. 2). That the official records of parliamentary discussion and action were not then accessible to the public is undeniable, but are we asked to believe that Parliament had some esoteric doctrine, some high ideals of government kept secret from the people? Is it not, rather, true that the prevalence in Parliament of doctrines similar to that of the fine lines Mr. Jusserand has quoted is proof—not presumptive, but positive—that they were commonly and widely held among the people of England? What legislative body in the history of the world has ever preceded the advanced thinkers of its time in the formulation of social and political ideals? Indeed, are not such ideals commonly at least a generation old before they can possibly be available for practical politics? We may assume, then, without danger of error, that the views held by Parliament were commonly held and discussed among intelligent Englishmen at the time when the *Piers Plowman* poems were written; and Mr. Jusserand has abundantly shown, in his brilliant and learned book on the poems, the kinship

of these views to the lines quoted. How could it be otherwise? Had not the people of England given practical expression to such views more than once in dealing with their kings, and most notably in dealing with the ill-fated Edward II? Such views had, furthermore, found theoretical expression even outside of England. Unquestionably the most famous political writer of the continent in the first half of the fourteenth century was Marsiglio of Padua, and his *Defensor Pacis* was his best-known work—world famous, indeed. This book is not immediately at hand as I write, so I will quote from the summary of it given by Loserth, *Geschichte des späteren Mittelalters* (p. 274): "Im Volke ruht die Quelle aller Gewalten, in seinen Händen liegt die Gesetzgebung, und der Regent ist nur sein vollziehendes Werkzeug. Er ist dem Volke verantwortlich und daher auch absetzbar." And such views were expressed abundantly by the political writers of the time. The unique merit of England lies in having put such ideas into practice hundreds of years before other nations did more than talk about them.

But the lines quoted by Mr. Jusserand demand one word more, for it may be alleged that their special feature—the point that distinguishes them from such utterances as those of Marsiglio—is emphasis of the power of the Commons. If so, one may detect a difference in attitude between the texts of the poems. I will not insist upon the fact that no such sentiments appear anywhere in the A text; but I cannot refrain from pointing out that C was, for some reason, dissatisfied with these noble lines. In C the passage runs (C, I, 139 ff.):

Thanne cam ther a kyng Knyghthod hym ladde,
The muche myghte of the men made hym to regne;
And thanne cam Kynde Witte and clerkus he made,
And Conscience and Kynde Witte and Knyghthod tegederes
Caste that the Comune sholde hure comunes fynde.

The function of the Commons is no longer political but purely industrial; they are to provide food for the rest of the community. Shall it be said that l. 140 was changed, not because of any difference of view on the part of the writer, but only in order to secure better alliteration? Was, then, this pioneer of advanced

thought, as Mr. Jusserand will have him, ready to sacrifice his most distinctive idea merely in order to avoid accenting *comunes* on the second syllable—an accentuation common and legitimate, though possibly a little antiquated? I think not. In fact to insist over much upon the democracy of this passage is to read into it very modern ideas, just as the democracy of *Magna Charta* was until recently overstated. Even in the B text the two lines following those quoted by Mr. Jusserand give the same conception of the function of the Commons as is given in C, and in almost the same words; and when, a few lines later the Angel warned the King, he spoke in Latin in order that the uneducated should not understand:—

And sithen in the eyre an heigh an angel of hevene
Lowed to speke in Latin — for lewed men ne coude
Jangle ne jugge that justifie hem shulde,
But suffren and serven.

The political and social views of these poems were, indeed, common views of Englishmen of that day; as Mr. Jusserand himself says, "he [the author] is not above his time, but of it."

In view of Mr. Jusserand's insistence upon the author's constant devotion to his poem and to social reform as evidence of unity of authorship, we may note in passing a feature that is certainly very hard to explain if these poems be, as Mr. Jusserand supposes, the work of a single author who took it "for his life's companion and confidant, adding new parts or new thoughts as years pass on and as events put their impress on his mind" (p. 3). The Peasants' Revolt of 1381 finds absolutely no record in the poems. Did this event, certainly the most notable as well as the most picturesque in the social history of England during the lifetime of the author, "put no impress" upon the mind of the man whose principal concern was "the great political movements, the general aspirations of the people;" who kept a copy of his poem constantly before him for the purpose of adding to it such thoughts and emotions as the changing events of the time gave him? The usual reply to such questions is, I know, that the A and B texts were written years before the Revolt occurred and the C text when it had already become ancient history. But obviously this

is an inadequate reply, if Mr. Jusserand's conception of the author and his mode of work is correct, for it immediately suggests the query, But why did he write nothing at this most stirring time? Why did he who, by the hypothesis, was ever making additions to his work, additions involving often only the insertion of single lines here and there, and whose MS was copied in all stages of incompleteness—why did he have no word of encouragement or of criticism for the revolutionists, of blame for the excesses charged upon them, or of chiding for the king upon his unfulfilled promises? Was he moved by none of these things, or was he alone in England ignorant of them?

Mr. Jusserand next wishes to prepare the way for his later discussion of the lost or misplaced leaf and the author's failure to notice it and set it right in the B text. To do this he attempts to establish for his author a character for carelessness and indifference concerning the condition in which his poem was published which is, to say the least, remarkable for a man whose life-work it was. Authors who subject their work to continual revision and amplification proceed always in the same way, says Mr. Jusserand. "The emendations or additions in the already written text are crammed into the margin or written on slips or fly-leaves. . . . It is not always easy to see where those modifications should come in." Such MSS have come down to us from the Middle Ages, and the inability of Montaigne's editors to find the proper places for the additions which he had scribbled in the margin of a copy of his 1588 edition or on loose slips and fly-leaves is cited as a notable example of the dangers of this mode of revision. "Superabundant proofs may be given that the author of *Piers Plowman* wrote his revisions in a similar way, handing, however, to less careful people (professional scribes) material requiring more care" (pp. 3 f.). All of this (substituting authors for author) might be cheerfully admitted without at all affecting the point at issue, for we have abundant proofs that men who were not the original authors of the works which they revised sometimes made their additions and revisions in the same way, and it is an old story in textual criticism that such additions, and even glosses and comments not intended as a part of the text, often found their way into the text when the

MS was recopied. It is a far cry from the establishment of such additions to the assumption of a single author.

Let us, however, examine the arguments a little more closely, for they deserve it. In the first place, a notable difference between the case of Montaigne's *Essais* and that of these poems is that Montaigne was dead when his friends prepared the edition in question for the press, whereas, according to Mr. Jusserand's hypothesis, the author of these poems was alive and constantly occupied with his text. Who can doubt that if Montaigne had lived to carry this new edition through the press or even to complete his preparations for it, he would have found or made right places for all his additions and insertions, as he did when he printed the edition of 1588 with many insertions and expansions in the first two books, which had been published in 1580? Digressions he would of course have permitted, for digressions were his specialty, but misplacements, we may be sure, would not have occurred.

We may next consider these careless professional scribes to whom Langland (as we will for brevity's sake occasionally call him) "handed" his original MS in various stages of revision. I find it somewhat difficult to understand their relations to Langland. Did he, the moneyless vagabond who lived in a cot with Kitte and Kalote and eked out a meager subsistence by writing legal documents and singing for the souls of such as had helped him or were willing to give him an occasional meal—did he hire these careless professional scribes? Or were the scribes paid by other men, who had read or heard of the poem and wished copies for themselves? If the latter be assumed, what becomes of the mystery in which the author enveloped his identity and the fear which caused him to omit from the C text the famous line supposed to contain his real name (p. 9, n. 4)? In any event, would he—himself a professional scribe, who says (C, XIV, 117ff.) the "gome" who copies carelessly is a "goky"—allow his own poems to be copied carelessly, whether the scribes were paid by himself or by his admirers? And if they were not professionals but amateurs who wished the copies for themselves—for I wish to give Mr. Jusserand's hypothesis every opportunity for justification—would not their admiration and interest have led them to ask the author

where these loose slips and fly-leaves belonged? Must we then suppose that the author himself knew nothing of the making of these copies, that Kitte and Kalote took advantage of his occasional absences in the Malvern Hills and elsewhere to issue editions of the poems in the stage of revision they happened to have reached at the time?

But it is time to examine the instances in which Mr. Jusserand thinks the author's additions and insertions were mistreated by careless scribes. Carelessness on the part of scribes we shall undoubtedly find, as was long ago pointed out by Professor Skeat, but very little evidence that the author's text was not in the first instance correctly copied. Mr. Jusserand (p. 4, n. 3) cites two¹ MSS of the A text (Univ. Coll. Oxf. and Rawl. Poet. 137) and one of the C (Cotton. Vesp. B XVI). The first two have "the same jumble of incoherent facts." Each is "regular down to *passus* ii, 25,² which is immediately followed (on the same page) by *passus* vii, 71-213, and then returns to l. 182 of *passus* i, some twenty lines of *passus* ii occurring twice over. It then goes down to *passus* vii, 70, when the passage which had already occurred is omitted" (Skeat quoted by Jusserand). But obviously what we have here is two MSS copied, as Professor Skeat says two lines above the passage quoted by Mr. Jusserand, "from an older and imperfect one, or still more probably from *two* [italics by Skeat] others, some of the leaves of which were out of place." The confusion was not in the author's MS, but in a later copy. That Professor Skeat is right is so immediately evident that no confirmation is needed, though it may be found abundantly in the fact that these MSS belong to a sub-group, derived from a MS which is itself derived from another which is derived from still another; and as this confusion is found only in this sub-group, it is clear that it occurred merely in the parent MS of this group and not in the author's original. The same remarks apply with slight modification to the confusion in Cotton. Vesp. B. XVI. That MS is a copy of a copy of a copy . . . of the earliest MS which can be reconstructed by the usual methods of genealogical text-criti-

¹ The MS at Trinity College, Dublin, has the same confusion.

² This is not quite accurate, but the inaccuracy does not affect the argument.

cism (which is not necessarily the author's original), and the confusion in question does not occur in any other of the extant MSS derived from these successive copies.

"Tentative additions written by the author on the margin or scraps," says Mr. Jusserand " . . . were inserted haphazard anywhere by some copyists and left alone by others [pp. 4 f.]. Of this sort are, to all appearances, the additional lines in MS Harl. 875 of A, not to be found elsewhere," etc. This MS does contain lines found in no other MS and a different version of some lines of the usual text, but it is clear that neither additions nor variants come from the author but are later modifications by some unskilful hand. I give a list of them marking those found in other MSS but in different form with the letter "d;" naturally I have not included scribal errors or minute variants in this list: I, 1 l. after 161, 176-77; II, 1 after 8, 1 after 9, 12 as 2 ll., 31, 34, 48, 93 d, 96, 118, 136-39, 141-43, 182, 201-2 (as 3 ll.) d; III, 19-20, 66, 91-94, 98, 180 d, 233 d, 234, 265-69 (as 3) d; IV, 154 d; V, 182, 257 d; VI, 1-2, 5, 45 d; VII, 5 d, 26, 226 d, 280 d; VIII, 46, 101, 125-26. Even Professor Skeat, who admits many of these lines into his text, says that some of them may be spurious.¹ The only one, in fact, for the genuineness of which serious contention could be made is VIII, 46 and, in my opinion, it is spurious, like the rest. The Ilchester MS also is cited by Mr. Jusserand as containing two versions of C, X, 75-281, one of them being, "it seems, a first cast of the other" (p. 5, n. 1). This MS is mainly a somewhat imperfect copy of the ordinary version of the C text, but at the beginning the scribe obviously had before him fragments of two texts. First we have the A text, Prol. 1-60, then the C text, X, 75-254, then A Prol. 55-76, and 80-83, then C, X, 255-81, then A Prol. 84-95, C, I, 91-152 and A Prol. 96-109; after which the usual version of C begins and runs on, with some gaps and misplacements, to the end. The two passages from C, X inserted in the A Prologue differ considerably from the usual version of these lines, which is found also in this MS at the proper place. Professor Skeat and Mr.

¹Cf. the statements of Chambers and Grattan in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, IV, 376 ff., where these and others of Mr. Jusserand's remarks concerning the A MSS are examined. Unfortunately I did not see this valuable article until my own remarks were in type.

Jusserand believe that they are a first cast of the usual version. I see no reason to believe this; they may quite as well be a later modification of C's text by some other writer—certainly the lines corresponding to C, I, 107–23, probably derived from the same source, are a variation, not a first cast. But no matter what they are, the condition of this text at the beginning shows that the scribe merely had before him an imperfect copy of the A Prologue and some odd leaves of a C text, viz., one leaf of 59 lines from C, I and four leaves from C, X.

There is no reason to believe that any of the confusions, additions or variations thus far dealt with go back to the author's copy. All the displacements of text are due to accidental displacements of the leaves of later MSS and to careless copying by later scribes. Numerous other instances occur in other MSS of these poems, and are very common in MSS of all languages and times. The only example of misplacement cited by Mr. Jusserand that really goes back to the original MS from which the others are derived, is that pointed out by me (A, VII, 71–75, B, VI, 80–84, C, IX, 80–86), where the names of the wife and children are inserted at the wrong point (but on the page to which they belong)—an error corrected by neither B nor C, although C inserted two lines (84, 85). It will be remembered that this failure of both B and C to restore these lines to their proper place was one of the reasons adduced by me for supposing that A, B, and C were not one and the same person. This bit of my ammunition does not fit Mr. Jusserand's gun and I cannot allow him to use it, even though he has been unable, as we have just seen, to procure any more. Besides, to drop the trope, it is not permissible to break the force of my original argument by separating this instance of the failure of both B and C to recognize and correct an error that had crept into the A text from the precisely similar though more striking instance in the case of the lost leaf. The two go together and are of mutual benefit and support, as will be shown below.

Before leaving this question of additions and variations in the MSS, it may be interesting to note that, even excluding the Ilchester MS (dealt with above), Rawl. Poet. 38 (supposed to

contain a revised version of the B text), and the three MSS which contain part or all of A, XII, nineteen of the remaining forty MSS contain additions or variations either peculiar to a single MS or found only in a small sub-group. It is of course impossible to present this mass of details here, but they are duly given in the Introductions and footnotes of Professor Skeat's EETS edition, and Professor Skeat himself, despite his unwillingness to part with any decent line, rightly recognizes that the additions as well as the variations are almost all spurious—he would save a few if he could. This is not only of interest in connection with the phase of Mr. Jusserand's argument which we have just discussed, but of even greater importance, as we shall see, for the general question of the possibility of larger additions and revisions by others than the original authors.

Mr. Jusserand next (p. 5) tries to support his contention that Langland allowed his MS to be copied in all stages of incompleteness by the fact that certain MSS contain less or more of the text than others. But the facts are capable of a very different interpretation. MS Harl. 875 and the Lincoln's Inn MS undoubtedly do not go beyond *passus* viii. I once thought that this fact might support my contention that the first author's work ceased with the vision of *Piers the Plowman* proper; but I fear it will serve neither my turn nor Mr. Jusserand's. Harl. 875 is shown, by the possession of certain errors in common with the Vernon MS, to belong to the same group as that MS and, like it, to be derived from a MS at least one remove from the source of all extant MSS of the A text. It is true that the Vernon MS might conceivably have obtained its continuation from another source, but this would be a gratuitous assumption. The Lincoln's Inn MS, at any rate, is too corrupt to be regarded as representing the author's original in any respect. Besides, to conclude from the cessation of a MS at a particular point that the author had written no more when the transcript was made is to conclude too hastily.¹ MS D, 4. 12 of Trin. Coll. Dublin (A text) stops with VII, 45. Are we to conclude that a transcript was made when the author had reached this point? But among the additions in this MS

¹ See Chambers and Grattan, *u. s.*, p. 377.

which extend the Prologue from 109 to 124 lines, says Professor Skeat (EETS ed., ii, pp. vi f., n.), there are two extra lines after l. 54 agreeing with Rawl. Poet. 137, two after l. 83 resembling B, 112, 113, and ten after l. 95 answering to B, Prol. 92-99, but in some places bearing a closer resemblance to the C text. In other words, we have here a striking instance of contamination of texts.¹ Again, Digby 171 (C text) ends with XVI, 65, and Professor Skeat remarks (Vol. III, p. xlv), "no more was ever written, as the next page was left blank." But the whole B text was then in existence. Are we, then, to suppose that Langland said to the scribe, "I have finished my revision of the B text only up to this point; you had better stop here?" But he might at least have let him go on with the following line of Latin and l. 66 of the text, which were left unchanged. Surely it would be rash in any of these cases to assume that the present ending of any MS represents a definite stage in composition, or revision.

The MSS containing parts of *passus* xii I will discuss below in connection with John But. I must, however, here take exception to Mr. Jusserand's statement (p. 6) that we hear of Dobet and Dobest only in the B and C texts and to his further statement (p. 7) that the heading in A MSS "Incipit hic Dowel, Dobet, et Dobest," makes it clear that the author already had in mind the expansion accomplished in the B text. Although the dreamer professes to be in search only of Dowel, the discussions and definitions almost invariably include Dobet and Dobest also,² and fully justify the heading quoted.

As for the "Explicit passus secundus de dobest et incipit passus tercius" of MS Laud 656 (C text), whether it be a mistake, as Professor Skeat thinks, or an indication, as Mr. Jusserand thinks, that the scribe expected and had reason to expect another *passus*, it has, in any event, no bearing upon the question of single or multiple authorship, as consideration of the possibilities will quickly convince anyone.

"That these three versions of the *Piers Plowman* poem exist is certain," says Mr. Jusserand (p. 7); "that they were written by

¹ See Chambers and Grattan, *u. s.*, p. 376.

² Cf. A, IX, 69 ff., 117 ff., X, 14, 85 ff., 211 ff., XI, 86 ff., 144, 177 ff., 217 ff.

someone cannot be considered a rash surmise. Of that *one* [italics mine] we know little; but that little is considered better than nothing; better than" the situation in those cases in mediaeval literature in which "we are reduced to mere surmises." The proposition that the poems were written by someone is, rightly understood, not a rash surmise. But what of the logical process by which we pass to the assumption that someone is some *one*? And after all, is it better to hold as knowledge what is only questionable hypothesis than to recognize that we are in regard to some questions reduced to mere surmises?

But, says Mr. Jusserand, for the unity of authorship of these poems and for the name of the author we have abundant evidence. In the first place, "without exception, all those titles, colophons, marginal notes, and testimonies agree in pointing to the succession of visions, forming at first 8 or 12 and lastly 23 *passus*, as being one work, having for its general title *Piers Plowman*, and written by one author" (p. 8). He quotes some headings to prove that scribes regarded the *Dowel*, *Dobet*, and *Dobest* poem as a part of the *Piers Plowman*. There was justification for these headings in the B and C texts, for *Piers Plowman* appears in these versions of *Dowel*, etc.; and there has never been any doubt that the authors of B and C treated the poems as in a certain sense forming a consecutive poem, but here, as often, Mr. Jusserand insists upon arguing concerning B and C, when the question at issue concerns the A text. The old habit of regarding A, B, and C as inseparable even for purposes of study is too strong. As a matter of fact there is no known MS of the unmixed A text which has any such indication.¹ Professor Skeat (EETS ed., Vol. I, pp. xxv f.) gives the titles of the *Dowel* poem in the A MSS, and remarks, "Hence it appears that there is here no thought of reckoning in the *passus* of *Dowel* as being any part of *Piers Plowman*, as was afterward done in MSS of the later types," and

¹ MS Harl. 3954, which has at the end of *passus* xi the colophon: "Explicit tractus [read tractatus] de perys plowman," quoted by Mr. Jusserand, is a mixture of the A and B texts, and, says Professor Skeat (EETS ed., Vol. I, p. xxiii), "I do not consider it of much value, and believe it to be frequently corrupted. . . . These [the concluding] lines are a sad jumble, and the 'praying for pers the plowmans soule' is particularly out of place, as *Piers* not the *author* of the poem but the *subject* of it."

he calls particular attention (p. xxv) to MS Douce 323, which has as the heading for *passus* x, "Primus passus in secundo libro."

"In the same fashion," says Mr. Jusserand, "all the notes found on their leaves, the allusions in the work and tradition attribute the work to a single author. Some of the notes vary as to the name or the form of the name or surname; not one implies more than one author for the whole." But does not this uncertainty as to the name suggest some doubt as to the authority with which these informants are vested? That during the fifteenth century tradition associated the name Langland (or Longlond) with the poems cannot be doubted, and is not incapable of reconciliation with the name Willelmi W. recorded in four¹ MSS (which since they belong to the same sub-group [see Skeat, III, p. xxxvii] are only a single testimony). I see no reason to repeat here what I said about the name in *Camb. Hist. Engl. Lit.* II, 34, 35, but I will comment on a few new points made by Mr. Jusserand. And first, as to the underlining of real names in red in MS B. M. Add. 35287. This is obviously peculiar to the scribe of this MS, and, unless my memory fails me (for I have misplaced my note on this point) does not occur in the earlier part of this MS.² That the scribe should have regarded the name "long Will" as a real name is easily intelligible, but has no more significance than the well-known remark in a late hand beside the same line, B, XV, 148 in MS Laud 581: "Nota, the name of thauctour." Any reader would easily take the statement of the text at its face value and rubricate, or annotate, or (as I have previously suggested) derive from the line supposed information as to the name of the author.

But we are not done with this famous line. "If we discarded the punning intention," says Mr. Jusserand (p. 9), the line would have little enough meaning: to 'live in land' does not convey any very clear idea." Without the context it certainly does not,

¹ Mr. Jusserand says "three;" but he overlooked MS B. M. Add. 35157, which, according to the catalogue, was unknown to Professor Skeat when he wrote.

² I have since found my note. There is no underlining in red in the first five *passus*, and no distinction as to capitalization is made between real persons and personifications. In *passus* xv *cristes*, 15, 16, *ysodorus*, 37, are neither underlined nor written in large letters; *Anima*, 23, *Animus*, 24, *memoria*, 26, *Racio*, 28, *Sensus*, 29, *Amor*, 34, are underlined in red, and *Mens*, 25, is written in large letters.

and we all owe thanks to Mr. Jusserand for calling attention to the fact that all of us have been reading the passage very carelessly—in fact, have been reading l. 148 alone. Let us remedy this at once by a careful consideration of the whole passage. Anima, in discussion with the dreamer, mentions Charity.

"What is Charite?" quod I tho. "A childissh thinge," he seide;
 "Nisi efficiamini sicut parvuli, non intrabis in regnum celorum;
 Withouten fauntelte or foly' a fre, liberal wille."
 "Where shulde men fynde suche a frende' with so fre an herte?
 I have lyved in londe," quod I: "my name is Longe Wille,
 And fonde I nevere ful Charite' bifore ne bihynde."

—B, XV, 145-49.

What then is the relation of l. 148 to the rest of the passage? How does the mention of the author's real name emphasize the declaration that he has never found charity? Surely in no possible manner. "I have lived in land" is clear enough; it means "I have lived in this world," I have had experience." But the name? its significance? Surely we have here not a real name but a popular locution implying *long* experience and observation. We have here only the equivalent of B, XIV, 97, 98:

"Where woneth Charite?" quod Haukyn. "I wiste nevere in my lyve
 Man that with hym spake; as wyde as I have passed.

In America, even in the refined society of the capital, Mr. Jusserand must have learned that, when an American replies to some statement difficult to believe by saying, "I'm from Missouri, you'll have to show me," it is not safe to infer that the speaker has ever even set foot in Missouri. For the benefit of others, it may be necessary to explain that this very common locution merely indicates that the speaker is not of a credulous nature and thinks that the matter in point requires proof; the origin of the phrase need not concern us. I know no other instance of Long Will with the meaning here suggested, but when in Heywood's *Dialogue of Proverbs* Pt. I. chap. xi, ll. 151, 152, the hard-hearted uncle replies to a petition on behalf of his penniless nephew:

¹For "in londe," cf. the quotations given in *Oxf. Eng. Dict.*, s. v. "Land," I. 3. †d, especially: "Welawo, to longe y lyue in londe," Sir Ferumbras, 2793.

But for my reward let him be no longer tarier,
I will send it him by John Longe the carier,¹

no one can suppose that the hapless young man will see the reward soon. In form the proverb is somewhat similar to, "My name is Twyford; I know nothing of the matter," Bohn's *Hand Book*, p. 62.

Mr. Jusserand cites the testimony of John Bale and calls him a man whose testimony is "of real weight." I will not insist upon the fact that Bale gives the author's name as Robert, because I think it highly probable that Bale's testimony is merely derived from the entry in MS Laud 581. "At the end of the MS," says Professor Skeat, "are the names of former owners: 'Raffe Coppinges. *Mem.* that I have lent to Nicholas Brigham the pers ploughman which I borrowed of M. Le of Addyngton.' At the top of the first page is loosely scribbled Robart Langelond borne by malverne hilles." That Bale derived much of his information from Brigham is well known to all students of Bale's *Index*; the notes just given establish a channel between Bale and MS Laud 581, in which the information may, indeed, have taken either direction. But this is by the way; the point that concerns us is that, for matters and men before his own day, Bale, though often useful, is far from trustworthy, as may be seen most easily from the absurdities in his accounts of Chaucer and Wiclif.²

II

In Section II (p. 12) Mr. Jusserand offers to relieve me of the burden of carrying John But as one of the authors of the poems. But I neither need nor desire this relief; in fact, I find John But rather a help than a hindrance to the discussion. That he is not so important as A, A2, B, or C, I readily admit; that he was a silly scribbler, a fool, if you will, I am not prepared to deny, although I ought to point out that Mr. Jusserand (p. 12, n. 2)

¹ Cf. also Heywood, *The Fifth Hundred of Epigrammes*, No. 66, and Bohn's *Hand Book of Proverbs*, p. 169.

² In the *Summarium* he says (198^{vo}): "Galfridus Chaucer . . . Boetium de consolatione philosophiae transtulit ad filium suum Ludovicum Chaucerum." He mentions among the works of Chaucer, *Trophaeum Lombardicum*, *De principum ruina*, *Emblemata moralia*, *De curia Veneris*, *Chrysidae testamentum*, and *Chrysidae quaerimoniam*, and adds, "Ad annum humanae redemptionis 1450 vizisse perhibetur sub Henrico sexto."

agrees with me that Professor Skeat was unable to distinguish John But's work from that of the continuator of A (A 2, as I call him), and that, low as one may rate the quality of But's lines, they are not properly comparable to the "lines added by scribes to make known their thirst and their joy at having finished copying *Piers Plowman*" (p. 12). John But's continuation, slight as it is, is of importance because it shows that men did not hesitate to continue or modify a text that came into their hands. And this conclusion is abundantly supported by the 19 MSS (cited above, p. 11) which contain variations and additions. In view of this evidence, it is obviously rash to assume that even important modifications like those in Ilchester and Rawl. Poet. 38 necessarily proceed from the author of B, though those in Ilchester and Rawl. Poet. 38 might be ascribed to B, without in the least obliging us to conclude that A, A 2, B, and C were one and the same person. John But, it will be remembered, wrote his conclusion of A, after the date of B, for he wrote in the reign of King Richard. That his work is signed, and the other additions anonymous, offers no difficulty. He signed out of vanity (cf. his claim that he is a poet: "for he medleth of makyng" XII, 105), and he carefully disclaims responsibility for anything but the conclusion.

But if there were three authors largely concerned in continuing these poems—John But was not *largely* concerned—"it is singular that they all chose to manifest it [their spirit] by anonymous additions to the work of someone else" (p. 13). Surely not. The reasons which induced the original author to remain anonymous, those which, according to Mr. Jusserand, induced C to cancel the too precise revelation of B, XV, 148, would induce continuators to remain anonymous. Besides we may well believe that these sincere men were interested primarily in the influence of their satire and, finding themselves in hearty sympathy, despite minor differences, with the poem as it reached them—as was the case also with multitudes who wrote not even a single line—they were glad to avail themselves of the great popularity of preceding versions for the spread of their own ideas. Such things have happened, if I mistake not, very often in the history of satire. A

very popular satire, if anonymous, is frequently, one might almost say usually, followed by a host of others professing to be by the same writer or making some use of any popular personality that may have been created by the original satirist. I need not cite modern instances; does not the author of *Mum, Sothsegger* (*Richard the Redeless*) identify himself with the author of *Piers Plowman*? Does not *Peres the Ploughmans Crede* make use of the same great name? Does not the *Ploughman's Tale* definitely claim to be by the author of the *Crede*?

"If the shadowy character of one author unseen, unmet by any contemporary, is strange, the same happening for four people concerned with the same problems would be a wonder" (p. 13). But surely not so great. They would be more elusive. They could not be recognized by any of the striking characteristics of the dreamer, since he is fictitious, whereas, as I have already said, if we have to do with a single author who describes himself, his family, and gives his name and dwelling-place, he could hardly have escaped discovery. But Mr. Jusserand thinks also that, if there were four principal authors, the intrusion of each successive one must have been resented and protested against by one or more of his predecessors; in the absence of protests, my theory requires, he thinks, that "each of these authors must have written and breathed his last with absolute punctuality, as moths lay their eggs, gasp, and die." But what right would the continuator of A have to protest against B, or B to protest against C, or C against the author of *Mum, Sothsegger*? And we hear of no protest against John But for "medling with makyng" and killing the author with undue haste, or against the persistent carelessness of the scribes, which, if Mr. Jusserand's theory be correct, must have sorely irritated the professional soul of William Langland. If death must be prayed in aid, we surely need sacrifice only one man, A, the author of the first two visions; and the high mortality of the plague in 1362, 1369, 1375-76, increases the ordinary probabilities of death for a man already of mature age in 1362, as A seems to have been. Mr. Bradley's explanation of the Robert the Robber passage seems to me, indeed, to involve the death of A before he had time to read and revise the

MS prepared from his loose sheets by the copyist; and I believe Mr. Bradley is entirely ready to admit this explanation of A's failure to correct the confusion. As will be seen later, I still regard my explanation of the confusion as more probable than his, but, like him, I do not regard the supposition of A's early death as a serious objection to his view. At any rate, there is no need to kill A 2 and B and C; and parsimony is one of the prime maxims of scientific hypothesis.

Mr. Jusserand's theory, on the other hand, seems to me to require, if I may use his figure, that the moth die or at least enter into a profound state of coma at each period of ovation and then revive to meditate another egg to be produced under the same circumstances. How else, unless we adopt the Kitte and Kalote theory suggested above, p. 8, are we to account for the fact that repeated experience of the carelessness of scribes never sufficed to induce Langland to give them oversight or aid in setting straight blunders that must have been observed by him in his continuous occupation with his poem?

III

This section and the next are devoted to the discussion of the passage concerning Robert the Robber and some details subsidiary to it.

Before proceeding to the main question, Mr. Jusserand attempts to show that in A the *passus* devoted to the sermon of Conscience and its effects upon the multitude is so uneven in execution as to suggest that parts of it are mere "memoranda to be developed later and put there simply for the name to appear in the list." This is intended to prepare the way for the later suppositions that there was not even a memorandum made to note the place of Wrath among the Seven Sins and that the Robber passage was an insertion on a loose leaf that had the misfortune to be misplaced by the scribe and unnoticed by the author, or at least uncorrected by him, for some thirty-six years, despite the fact that, according to Mr. Jusserand, the author had at least five opportunities in the meantime to put it in its right place (see below, p. 22). Before discussing the criticisms of

this *passus*, I wish to point out that even if they held good, even if we had to conclude that this *passus* as it stands in A is sketchy and unfinished, this conclusion would leave the failure of B to notice and correct the confusion concerning Robert the Robber as much in need of explanation as before. The question is not, how did the confusion occur, but, why did not B notice and correct it? Bearing this definitely and firmly in mind, we may pause a moment to consider, in a sort of parenthesis, as it were, the criticisms of the *passus*.

They concern principally "Lechour" and "Sloth," though Pride is dealt with quite as briefly. One may undoubtedly feel regret that we have no such portraits of the representatives of these sins or of Wrath (omitted entirely) as we have of Envy, Coveitise, and Glotoun; but, before criticizing the poet for their absence, we ought to inquire whether he had not an artistic purpose in this difference of treatment. Such a purpose is, I think, not difficult to discover for Pride and Lechour. To put it briefly, the author wished to communicate to us a sense of the *immediate* and powerful effects of the preaching of Conscience. That we do receive such an impression is undeniable, and observation of our emotions as we read will show, it seems to me, that the brevity of the statements in regard to Wille, Pernel, and Lechour, is no small element in the production of this impression. Having secured this effect, the poet is at liberty to develop Envy and the rest with greater breadth and fulness. As for Sloth, if my theory of the "lost leaf" is correct, it is possible that this loss has deprived us of a few lines of his confession, as, in my opinion, it clearly has of the conclusion of Envy.

"There is [in the case of Lechour] no confession at all," and "the privation he mentions . . . leaves him a margin for many sins, especially his favorite one" (p. 15). But no confession, in the technical sense, was intended. In the case of Pride and Lechour, we have only sudden outcries of guilty souls pleading for mercy and promising amendment. The temperance of Lechour and the hair shirt of Pernel (p. 30) are not at all in the nature of penance, they are remedies against the besetting sins. The hair shirt is a well-known remedy against pride, a reducer to humility

of the rebellious flesh; and in the *Parson's Tale* we read (§ 82): "Another remedie agayns Lecherie is specially to withdrawen swiche thinges as yeve occasion to thilke vileinye: as ese, etinge and drinkinge; for certes, whan the pot boyleth strongly, the best remedie is to withdrawe the fyr." The only other remedies mentioned in the *Parson's Tale* are continence itself and eschewing the company of the tempter. Our poet, putting into the mouth of Lechour a brief outcry of guilt and repentance, allows him that remedy which, according to mediaeval theory, was the best "whan the pot boyleth strongly."

This brings us to Mr. Jusserand's discussion of the Robert the Robber passage. The situation is briefly this: all are agreed that A, V, 236-59 are a source of confusion as they stand, and that an error of some sort has occurred. I observed that another error occurred in the same *passus* in the omission of Wrath from the Seven Sins, and finding that a single supposition, that of the loss of the next to the innermost pair of leaves of a quire, would completely account for both errors, I proposed this as the simplest explanation. Mr. Bradley, reviewing my theory, agreed with me in regard to the existence of the two errors, but thought it more probable that the faults occurred before the poem was put into regular form, and suggested that the copyist to whom the author's loose papers were handed for transcription lost those containing the confession of Wrath and misplaced that containing the Robert the Robber passage. Mr. Jusserand holds that the author forgot to write a confession of Wrath and that the Robert the Robber passage was a later addition written on a loose slip which the copyist inserted at the wrong place. His theory no less than Mr. Bradley's or mine requires him to account for the singular failure of B to remedy the confusion caused by the Robert the Robber passage. This, it will be remembered, is the crucial point in this argument. And I think I may also fairly insist that the notable failure of both B and C to notice the confusion caused by the misplacement of the name passage¹ (A, VII, 71-75; B, VI, 80-84;

¹ It has been generally assumed that these four or five lines (for it is difficult to say whether the passage includes only 71-74 or 71-75), since they appear in all MSS, are the work of A. That they were written in the margin of the ancestor of all extant MSS is certain, but they do not sound to me like A's work and I do not feel sure that they were not written in

C, IX, 80-86), which Mr. Jusserand disposes of lightly in a footnote on p. 5, must also be dealt with seriously as tending, like these other instances, to show that B and C were not the same man as A.

Before we proceed, however, to examine Mr. Jusserand's attempt to explain B's failure to place the Robert the Robber passage where it belonged, let us note a curious feature in his theory as to how it came to be misplaced. "It has all the appearance of an afterthought," written on a loose slip, "which Adam Scrivener of sleepy pen would copy anywhere" (p. 18). Was Adam then, so sleepy that he could not see that lines 236-41 could not possibly be attached to Sloth and yet so wide awake that he rewrote the first line, as being unsuitable to the connection—if Mr. Jusserand (p. 22, n. 2) is right—changing "He highte zyvan zeld azeyn" to "And zit I-chulle zelden azeyn"?

The misplacement having occurred, Mr. Jusserand continues: "For what concerns the author himself, maybe, while making so many changes in so many places he never paid any attention to this passage (in which as a matter of fact he introduced no change at all); maybe also he thought of transferring it to its proper place and neglected to mark it accordingly or to see that the removal was made" (p. 18). A general supposition of carelessness or neglect is perhaps always plausible, but the special circumstances of this case render both of the suppositions just quoted highly improbable. Let us see.

In the first place, this is a book to the composition and revision of which, according to hypothesis, the author devoted his life. Copies of his work were made from time to time; at least five copies, if Mr. Jusserand is right, before the author corrected this glaring error. Five I say, and I emphasize it. After the original MS containing only the first eight *passus* of A (p. 5), (then the version represented by the Lincoln's Inn MS with its peculiar readings?), then that represented by Harl. 875 with its added lines (p. 5, n. 1), then an eleven *passus* version (p. 5), then a version with a part of a twelfth *passus* (p. 6), then the B text,

the MS by some one else after it left the hands of A. The authorship of the lines of course, has no bearing upon the question of the identity of A, A 2, B, and C.

then the revision of B represented by Rawl. Poet. 38 (p. 5, n. 2). Whatever may be thought of the importance of the variations in some of these MSS, each new copy, if derived, as Mr. Jusserand supposes, from the author's copy, at least offered an opportunity for correcting the error. But, says Mr. Jusserand, the author made no changes in this passage, the two lines omitted by B were omitted by a mere scribal oversight. The oversight must, then, have occurred in a copy made for B's personal use, for it appears in all the copies or versions derived from B—in the ordinary version of B, in the revised text of Rawl. Poet. 38, in the preliminary C text of the Ilchester MS, and in the ordinary C text. And either the author or the scribe made other changes in the passage in the B text; thus in A, 241 we read:

I schal seche seynt Treuthe^r er I seo Rome,

and in B, 468:

I shal seke treuthe arst^r ar I se Rome;

in A, 243, all the MSS have "wher-with," in B, 470, all have "wher-of;" in A, 250, all the MSS have "red," in B, 475, all have "reddere;"¹ in A, 252, all have "knowe," in B, 476, all except the revised R have "owe." These are minutiae, to be sure, but nothing justifies us in assuming that the changes were made by the scribe. And certainly the scribe did not insert the 32 lines which immediately follow this passage in B (ll. 485-516), and which clearly show that B had been revising in this portion of the work.

That a man may read over his own work more than once without noticing errors and inconsistencies is, alas! too true, as all of us can testify, but Mr. Jusserand's parallels to this case seem hardly in point. Mr. Roosevelt, it seems, read three proofs and published several editions of his *Outdoor Pastimes of an American Hunter* before he discovered that on a single page he had given in two varying forms the information that "bobcats are very fond of prairie dogs, and haunt the dog towns as soon as spring comes." Such an oversight is easily intelligible; the sen-

¹ Mr. Knott informs me that three of the MSS which were not collated by Skeat have *reddere*, by contamination of their source with B. I have neglected to inquire about the other passages cited here, as the existence of contaminated readings would not affect the argument.

tences are varied in expression, and neither contains anything incongruous with the general situation. But the cases are different. In the first place, if Mr. Jusserand is right, Langland was a man of very different temperament from Mr. Roosevelt. In the second place, great as may have been the care Mr. Roosevelt took with this book, it can hardly be maintained that he devoted his life to it or regarded it as his life-work. Thirdly, I venture to suggest that, if the carelessness of copyist or printer had allowed a gnu or a rhinoceros to stroll into the village of the prairie dogs, Mr. Roosevelt would have recognized and ejected the intruder in a moment. And this would be a parallel case, for the Robert the Robber passage is as much out of place in connection with Sloth. The author could not fail to recognize, as soon as he read it or any part of it, that it did not belong here.

The citation of the misplaced leaf in *Don Quixote* I do not understand, though a reviewer in the *London Times* also suggested that a consideration of it and especially of Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelley's remarks upon it would be beneficial to me. The fact is that Mr. Fitzmaurice-Kelley is confident that Cervantes did not write the passage about the stealing of Dapple or put it in the place it occupies. He says, "We are forced, by the logic of facts and evidence, to the conclusion that the additions were made by Robles or by Cuesta" (Introduction to his ed. of Ormsby's translation, Glasgow, 1901, p. xvi). Mr. Ormsby was of the same opinion; in his note on the passage (Vol. I, p. 168) he says, "But Cervantes, there can be very little doubt, had nothing whatever to do with this passage." The argument is too long to be resumed here, but the reasons for refusing to credit Cervantes with the blunder are singularly like those for disconnecting the original author with the failure to perceive and remove the blunders in *Piers Plowman*.

Another example Mr. Jusserand thinks he can give from the C text. The ten lines added by C after the names of Piers's wife and children are, he thinks (p. 20), out of place; they really are addressed by Piers to the Knight and belong just before C, IX, 53. "What 'dere sone' is he now [in l. 91] addressing?" says Mr. Jusserand; and his reply is, "the Knight." But without

emphasizing the unlikelihood that the peasant Piers would assume this tone with the Knight and call him "dere sone," it is clear that C intended the passage to stand precisely where it now stands in the C text, and the "dere sone" of l. 91 is the "sone" whose name begins in l. 82. Let us look at the passage:

- Hus sone hihte Suffre thy sovereynes have here wil
 Deme hem nouht for yf thou do' thou shalt dere abigge
 Consaile nat the comune the Kyng to displese
 85 Ne hem that han lawes to loke lacke hem nat ich hote
 Let god worthe withal as holy writ techeth
 Maistres as the meynes ben and grete men senatours
 What thei comaunde as by the kyng contrepleide hit nevere
 Al that thei hoten ich hote heyliche thou suffre hem
 90 By here warnyng and [wordyng] worch thou ther-after
 Ac after here doynge do thou nat my dere sone, quath Piers.

I have left this unpunctuated because any punctuation must involve an editorial interpretation, and I wish the passage to be its own interpreter. Is not this from beginning to end inseparably connected with l. 82? Is this not merely one of the many examples of the carelessness and thoughtlessness with which expansions were made in the revisions? The advice is appropriate enough for the son, it is highly unsuited for the Knight. There can be no doubt, I think, that awkward as the passage is, impossible as it is to tell where name ends and advice begins, it is in the place C intended it to have. It is a slight confirmation of this that l. 86, which C incorporates in the passage Mr. Jusserand wishes to transfer, follows C 83 immediately in both the A and B texts.

But after all, Mr. Jusserand thinks that B did notice that Robert the Robber was in the wrong place, and that he prepared to transfer it to the proper place but neglected to mark it for removal (p. 18). Evidence of intention he finds in the passages on restitution which B inserted in Coveitise. Quoting B, V, 232ff., he remarks: "The restitution here alluded to is precisely that which a penitent thief should make, the question being of stolen goods." True, and it would be making too fine a point, perhaps, to hint that this insertion, good as it is, is not in harmony with

A's account of Coveitise, since A represents him as dishonest and full of cheating tricks but not as a robber or a thief; though we all know that in some ages of the world merchants accustomed to cheat systematically and daily would be aghast at the thought of formal theft or robbery. What really is of significance is: (1) that B does not make these insertions in such form or at such places as to aid in attaching the Robber passage to Coveitise; (2) that they are as fully accounted for without the transfer of the Robber passage as with it; (3) that, if B intended to transfer the passage, he made no preparations for the transfer in the passage itself, he neither restored to the MS the line:

Then was ther a Walishman' was wonderliche sory,

which Mr. Jusserand thinks belonged to the original text but was torn off or otherwise lost from the loose leaf the scribe of A had (p. 22, n. 2), nor restored to its original form the line:

And ȝit I-chulle ȝelden aȝeyn' ȝif I so much have

which the scribe of A had thoughtfully substituted for:

He highte 'ȝyvan ȝeld-aȝeyn,' etc.

Furthermore, if Mr. Jusserand accepts Professor Skeat's view that MS Laud 581 was corrected by the author himself, or perhaps indeed his own autograph, it is worth observing that neither the large nor the small crosses noted by Professor Skeat as indicating places where corrections were to be made (Vol. II, pp. lxix) stand beside this passage.

The crowning proof that Langland wrote the Robert the Robber passage and knew where it belonged, although he neglected repeated opportunities to put it in its proper place or even to restore it to its original form, is, according to Mr. Jusserand, the fact that thirty-six years after it was misplaced, C assigned it to Coveitise, where it belonged all the time; moreover, he restored to it a missing line so marvelously adapted to its purpose as to mark him as beyond a doubt the original author (p. 22). Some objections to the view, held by Mr. Bradley and Mr. Jusserand, that this passage was originally attached to Coveitise may be found below (p. 60). These are confirmed by the fact, just mentioned,

that through all the years of his occupation with the poem B gave no sign that he knew that the first line of this passage was missing and that the second had been rewritten by a misinformed scribe. Moreover, the joining of this passage to Coveitise by C is not the simple and satisfactory thing it may seem to those who have not examined it carefully. In the first place, the so-called restoration of reading in the second line has changed a perfectly simple and grammatical sentence into a *monstrum informe, cui lumen ademptum*, neither the flesh of a name nor the fish of a promise, a ghastly amphibian whose existence cannot be justified by any of the passages quoted by Mr. Jusserand (p. 23, n. 3). Again, it is well to remember that there are sometimes two ends to a passage, and to look at the other end of this. It will then appear at once that C is not replacing the passage in the position it ought to have occupied all the time in the A and B texts, but transferring to this place a passage that belonged elsewhere and patching up a connection at the joints by using some of the old material of B for the newcomer. Thus C, VII, 334-37 is a reworking of B, V, 290, 291, applied now to Robert the Robber instead of to Syr Hervy Coveitise. See, moreover, how the whole insertion, C, VII, 309-39, breaks into and destroys B's fine conception of the despair of Coveitise (B, V, 286-92). Finally, observe that C's placing of the passage in question under Coveitise does not stand alone and unexampled. As Professor Skeat long ago pointed out, it is only a part of a general process by which C transfers to the Seven Sins passages of similar content from various parts of the B text. Thus, after B, V, 48 (the sermon), C inserts B, X, 292-329; after B, V, 71 (Pride), he inserts B, XIII, 278-84, 292-313, preceded by a few lines of his own; B, VII, 72-75 (Lechery) he transfers to a somewhat later position and adds B, XIII, 344-52, with some lines of his own; of B's account of Envy he omits a part, but after B, V, 119 inserts B, XIII, 325-42; B's Wrath he leaves with little change; but Coveitise he changes much, inserting after B, V, 267 the following bits: B, XIII, 362-68, 371-75, 384-89, 392-99, and after B, V, 289 the Robert the Robber passage; B's Glutton is left practically unchanged, but at the end of Sloth (B, V, 462) he inserts B, XIII, 410-57. Are all these passages from B, X and B,

XIII passages which careless scribes had misplaced and which it required the hand of the author to restore to their original places? No one will maintain such a thesis. And it seems clear that C had no better reason for his transfer of the Robber passage than for his transfer of the others.

The much lauded Welshman *zyvan zeld-azeyn* does not, I admit, impress me greatly. He doesn't seem to me genuine, and I fancy I can see C concocting him out of the hint afforded by the alliteration of "*zelden azeyn*." And he seems, after all, to have been a gentle thief; indeed, from his name one might easily infer that thieving was altogether contrary to his nature. If C names his people on the same principles as A, we ought to infer that his residence in the West Countrie, far from giving him an unfavorable opinion of the Welsh, had impressed him with their fundamental honesty. Chaucer, indeed, always speaks respectfully of the Welsh (perhaps in remembrance of Kynge Arthour and the Bret Glascurion, whom Mr. Jusserand has overlooked), but we have the immemorial jingle to assure us that

Taffy was a Welshman,
Taffy was a thief.

Finally, we may be pretty sure that Dr. Furnivall was right in demanding for the antecedent of *Reddite* not a person named with an English equivalent of this word, but an exhortation to restitution containing, probably, some Latin quotation in which this word *Reddite* was prominent, or perhaps, as Mr. Knott reminds me, a character definitely named in Latin, like "*Vigilate the veil*."

IV

Continuing the discussion of the Robert the Robber passage, Mr. Jusserand (pp. 25, 28, 29) attacks my statement that B made insertions in Sloth intended to justify the lines on restitution. He finds in these insertions "no intimation that any of his misdeeds was committed with the intention of *winning* money; it was with him mere negligence" (p. 28). That negligence is the principal element in Sloth is true, but in the following lines inserted by B I think I find another element, in preparation, as I have said, for the restitution passage:

ȝif I bigge and borwe it, · but-ȝif it be ytalled, 429
 I forȝete it as ȝerne; · and ȝif men me it axe
 Sixe sithes or sevene, · I forsake it with othes,
 And thus tene I trewe men · ten hundreth tymes.

That the forgetfulness is not altogether involuntary is suggested by "ȝerne" and certainly a man who has to be asked six times or seven for a just debt and constantly denies it, is guilty of more than negligence. But even if one insists upon finding in these lines and in l. 435, which tells how Sloth treats his servants when they demand the wages that are overdue, only culpable negligence and not dishonest intent, the mere fact that money has been improperly withheld from its rightful claimants is sufficient reason for restitution on the part of a repentant sinner. Mr. Jusserand maintains that if B had introduced any lines in order to lead up to and justify the restitution passage, he would have changed the word *wan* in A, V, 237:

Al that I wikkedly wan · sith I witte hadde.

But surely this is demanding of B an attention to details and a care for systematic revision justified no better by Mr. Jusserand's conception of him than by mine. Finally it is difficult to discover why B introduced such additions as I have pointed out if they were not intended to prepare the way for the restitution passage. Injury to one's own estate is regularly recognized as one of the results of sloth, the increase of it is not.

Mr. Jusserand next argues that neither A, B, nor C can make a correct list of the Seven Sins on the first trial, and that this proves that they are one and the same person. Four attempts at lists occur in the poems, in A, II and V, and B, XIII and XIV (= C, XVII), and only one of them is correct, says he. But let us not take the facts without inquiring into their meaning. The third list is complete. Moreover, B had apparently no difficulty in discovering that the first and second (in A) were incomplete, and he would therefore probably in his examination of the text, while it was passing through the four stages represented by B, Rawl. Poet. 38, Ilchester, and C, have observed and remedied the omission of Envy in the fourth list (B, XIV = C, XVII), unless there were some particular reason for not doing so.

That reason is, perhaps, not hard to discover. B begins to expound the dangers threatening the wealthy, but before he has finished with the first Sin, Pride, he has mentioned the poor, and having touched this, his favorite theme, his exposition, forgetting its original purpose, becomes immediately, that is, with the discussion of Pride, the first Sin, a praise of the immunity which poverty enjoys from every sin:

If Wratthe wrastel with the pore, · he hath the worse ende (l. 224)
 And if Glotonie greve poverte, · he gadereth the lasse (l. 229)
 And if Coveitise wolde cacche the pore thei may nouȝt come
 togideres (l. 238)
 Lecherye loveth hym nouȝt for he ȝeveth but lytel sylver (l. 249)
 And though Sleuthe suwe poverte · and serve nouȝt god to paye,
 Mischief is his maister · and maketh hym to thynke
 That god is his grettest helpe.¹ (ll. 253-55)

With this changed intention, it is not hard to see why Envy is omitted.² Envy can hardly be called a sin against which poverty is an effective remedy. The same reason that caused B to omit Envy would prevent C from adding it.

The situation, then, is this: We have two lists from which, for some reason yet to be determined, the sin of Wrath is omitted; of the two remaining lists, one is complete and the incompleteness of the other is clearly due to a cause which cannot be invoked for the first two. Is it not too bold to assert, on the basis of such evidence, that we have to do with an author incapable of making a complete and correct list? Whatever may be the cause of the incompleteness of the first two lists, permanent inability to make

¹ After a simile, follows a discussion of what poverty is.

² In all the MSS of B except R, the last two lines of Wrath and all of Glotonie are omitted, but R several times has passages necessary to the context that can only have been omitted from the other MSS by mistake.

CXVII, although tabulated as a fifth version, is rightly said in the text to be only a slight variant of B, XIV. The variation is, indeed, of even less importance than one might suppose. B does not, as a matter of fact, spoil this list by discussing or listing Sloth twice. Sloth is formally discussed in ll. 233 ff., and the word "sloth" is used in connection with "gluttony" in l. 234, but this casual use of a word can surely not be counted as another treatment of Sloth, in view of the fact that all the sins are treated definitely and formally. There are equally good, if not better, grounds for saying that B regarded Coveitise and Avarice as different sins and tried to make up the count of seven in that way, for ll. 238-43 are formally devoted to Coveitise and ll. 244-48, with equal formality, to Avarice. Sloth, we may safely maintain, is not listed twice; and C's correction in l. 77 is not a correction of the list as a list, but a mere variant, of no more significance than other variant readings in the same passage, such as C, XVII, 64, 68, 70, 71, 76, 79, etc.

a complete list can hardly be spoken of as "the author's mark, his seal and signature." And since it is incredible that a mediaeval author who could count as high as seven should have been unable to make a complete list of the Seven Sins when he deliberately set himself to do so, as is certainly the case in both A, II and A, V, we seem irresistibly led to the conclusion that the absence of Wrath in both instances is due to accidents that occurred after the original had left the author's hands.

Concerning the confession of Wrath added by B, Mr. Jusserand maintains that I am wrong in regarding it as so unlike the work of A as to suggest that A and B are not the same person, and his argument is twofold: "(1) An author is not bound, under pain of being cleft in twain, always to show the same merits, in every respect, on every occasion, at all times; (2) the confessions in it are not so good and the additions in B are not so bad as Mr. Manly makes them out." To the first proposition, as a general proposition, I readily and heartily assent, but it remains none the less true that such differences may exist between two pieces of writing as strongly to suggest difference of authorship. Such differences I presumed to point out in this instance and I regarded them as important in connection with the numerous other reasons we have for suspecting that A and B were not the same. As to the second proposition, it does not touch the point at issue. I have never, at any time or in any place, denied the ability of B to write lines as good as any written by A; on the contrary, B has some passages which—as I think and have always thought—are entirely out of the range of A's ability. But the excellences of A and B are different and their defects are also different. Mr. Jusserand attempts here and elsewhere to meet this point, partly by emphasizing certain fine qualities of B's work, which I recognize as heartily as he, and partly by trying to show that A is guilty of the same sort of confusion of thought shown by B. Thus, here he tries to answer my charge that the confession of Wrath in B gives us really a picture of Envy rather than of Wrath, by saying, (1) that some of A's portraits are inappropriate to the Sins to which they are assigned and (2) that Envy and Wrath are so much alike that B

cannot justly be criticized for giving us a portrait of Envy and labeling it Wrath.

The example of inappropriate traits in portraiture by A alleged by Mr. Jusserand is furnished by Pride, and two lines are specified in support of the allegation. In both instances I disagree with him as to the interpretation of the lines. In order that there may be no mistake I will quote the whole passage:

Pernel Proud-herte platte hire to grounde, (45)
 And lay long ar heo lokede and to ur Ladi criede,
 And beohizte to him that us alle maade,
 Heo wolde unsouwen hire smok and setten ther an here
 Forte fayten hire flesch that frele was to synne: (49)
 "Schal never high herte me hente bote holde me lowe,
 And suffre to beo misseid — and so dude I nevere.
 And now I con wel meke me and merci beseche
 Of al that ichave ihad envye in myn herte." (53)

The lines quoted as inappropriate to Pride are ll. 49 and 53. Mr. Jusserand thinks that l. 49 implies that Pernel had been guilty of lechery, and cites a similar phrase from the account of Mede.¹ But Pride is one of the sins of the flesh, disciplined, as I have shown above (p. 20), by the wearing of a "hair;" and "frail to sin" would not necessarily imply the particular kind of sin which Mr. Jusserand has in mind; and, finally, "frele" is apparently the reading of MS V only, "fers" or "fresch" being probably the original reading in A as well as in B.² In l. 53 Mr. Jusserand finds Pernel confessing the sin of Envy (in the modern sense), but there is no other hint of this attitude on the part of Pernel, and the word "envy" may mean only "hatred" or "ill-will," as may be seen from the quotations given in the *N. E. D.*, s. v. 1. We have no right to impose upon words meanings unsuited to the context when there are others that suit the

¹ In A, III, 117, one group of MSS (V and H) have:

Heo is frele of hire flesch fikel of hire tonge;

the other group (T, U, D) have "feith" instead of "flesch;" that "feith" is the original reading is perhaps indicated by the fact that H of the other group has "feith" instead of "tonge."

² Professor Skeat gives the readings thus "frele] fers T; fresch H U." H, which belongs to the same group as V, has therefore not the reading of V; "fresch" is, as the genealogy indicates, the right reading; "fers" is simply a variant spelling of "fresch."

context perfectly. The supposed fault in the confession of Lechour I have already dealt with (p. 20).

Mr. Jusserand's second contention, that Envy and Wrath are so much alike or so closely connected that B cannot be criticized for confusing them, may now be examined. At the top of p. 31, he quotes two lines from the A text about the sowing of strife by Envy, and says this is "one of the classical attributes of Wrath." That Wrath may be the motive for such action is true, but so may Envy, and in the line preceding those quoted by Mr. Jusserand Envy explains his motive thus:

His grace and his good hap · greveth me ful sore.

—A, V, 79.

Continuing, Mr. Jusserand calls attention to the fact that Chaucer's chapter on Wrath in the *Parson's Tale* begins: "After Envye wol I discryven the sinne of Ire. For soothly whoso hath Envye upon his neighebor, anon he wole comunly finde him a matere of wrathe, in word or in dede, agayne him to whom he hath envye." This is, indeed, the beginning, but it does not justify the substitution of Envy for Wrath. Chaucer's next sentence is: "And as well comth Ire of Pryde as of Envye; for soothly he that is proud or envious is lightly wrooth." Finally, Mr. Jusserand points out in Chaucer's chapter on Wrath many particulars which show "how vague were the limits then assigned to each sin." But in the Middle Ages the Seven Sins were treated as tempers or tendencies out of which particular misdeeds grow. And, naturally, the same deed, the same sin, may originate in any one of several different tempers or tendencies. The Sins are ruling passions which may lead to very various manifestations. The point in our present discussion is this: In A the Sins are personifications of the ruling passions or tendencies—Pernel is Pride, Lechour is the lecherous man, Envy is the envious man, Coveitise is the avaricious man, Glutton is the drunkard, Sloth is the slothful man (and I think I have met successfully the effort to show confusion in the characterization), whereas B's Wrath is in no sense the wrathful man, but only a meddlesome busy body. who, animated sometimes apparently by Envy and sometimes by a general love of slander, does things which cause jangling and strife, but is himself, so far

as appears, not at all subject to the sin of Wrath. C felt this, apparently, for he rewrote the beginning to remedy the defect; cf. C, VII, 105-14.

Mr. Jusserand's playful suggestion that the style of the *Parson's Tale* could be used as an argument that it is not by Chaucer, is by no means so absurd as it may seem. It is, indeed, perfectly clear that the style of this tale is determined by another personality than that of Chaucer. It exhibits none of his characteristic qualities, precisely because it is, in its determinative elements, not his work, because he is not the creator of the thought and style but a mere translator, whose personal qualities have left scarcely a trace, if any, upon the translation. In other words, we have in the *Parson's Tale* in reality not the style of Chaucer but that of other men of entirely different gifts.

V

In Part V Mr. Jusserand deals with some instances in which I asserted that B or C had misunderstood his predecessor or spoiled a passage written by him. He suggests that the examples I gave were "doubtless the best available ones." They were, indeed, merely specimens, and the number might easily have been increased; they suited my purpose especially, partly because they could be very briefly phrased—and I was throughout the article obliged to study brevity as much as possible—and partly because they seemed to me, as Mr. Jusserand says they seem to him, "very telling ones if they held good." That they do hold good, in spite of the attack upon them, I hope to be able to show.

1. I said: "In II, 21 ff., Lewte is introduced as the leman of the lady Holy Church and spoken of as feminine." Mr. Jusserand's reply is threefold: (a) "There cannot be any question here of B having misunderstood A, as the passage is quite different in both texts and there is no mention at all of Lewte in A;" (b) "Lemman does not necessarily mean a man;" (c) "Very possibly there may be nothing more in the passage than a scribe's error, 'hire' being put for 'him.'" I should reply: (a) Surely making the leman of lady Holy Church feminine involves a spoiling of the conception of A, and a misunderstanding or for-

getfulness of it—for misunderstanding may accompany the addition of lines and characters; (b) I was aware that “leman” may mean a woman as well as a man, and I have nowhere suggested that it could not, my point being that here the “leman” of a lady is spoken of as feminine; (c) there is nothing in the text to indicate that “hire” is a scribe’s error for “hym;” and when we have so many evidences of B’s tampering with the conceptions of A, we have no right to relieve him in this case by a purely gratuitous assumption. But, says Mr. Jusserand, C corrected it to “hym.” So he did; C more than once corrects B’s errors, as I originally pointed out. But if it was a scribe’s error, it is notable that it appears in all the texts of B and was therefore apparently in the original of B (which, according to Mr. Jusserand, was the author’s own copy, which he kept by him and allowed to be copied from time to time); it is not marked for correction in MS Laud 581, which Professor Skeat regards as the author’s autograph, containing indications of errors that must be corrected; Rawl. Poet. 38, which, according to Skeat and Jusserand, is a revised version of B, is not available for this line. The evidence is therefore pretty strong that the error was B’s, and it cannot be disposed of by the convenient but unsupported supposition of a scribe’s error. To say, as Mr. Jusserand does, “Of B having failed to understand or of having committed any error, there is *no trace*,” seems to me unwarranted by the facts.

2. I said: “In II, 25, False instead of Wrong is father of Meed, but is made to marry¹ her later.” Mr. Jusserand’s reply is here more elaborate but not more successful, I think. He maintains that Wrong was very badly chosen as a father for Meed, that B recognized this and improved the situation by making Favel the father, though, unfortunately, the scribe again misrepresented B’s intention and put “False” instead of “Favel.” This scribe is surely a most troublesome person, though this was not discovered until after my theory was propounded, Professor Skeat, indeed, going so far as to comment upon the remarkable

¹ Of course I was wrong in saying, and Mr. Jusserand in repeating (p. 33), that False marries Meed; they are ready to marry but the wedding is prevented.

purity of the B text, and to maintain that in one copy of it we have the author's autograph. "Wrong was very badly chosen [by A] as a father for Meed, and was given, besides, nothing to do," says Mr. Jusserand. "The marriage was not arranged by him; the marriage portion was not supplied by him; in the journey to Westminster he was forgotten; his part was limited to signing, first among many others, the 'feoffment' charter supplied by other people." Whether Wrong was appropriately chosen as a father for Meed, is, I take it, a question of opinion and taste; I myself feel that Favel (= Flattery) is hardly as appropriate as Wrong for the father, or main cause, of Meed. And I do not understand Mr. Jusserand to argue that A's failure to assign Wrong as prominent a part in the preparations for the marriage as Mr. Jusserand thinks he ought to play is reason for believing that A really intended another character as the father but, like B, was baffled of his purpose by a careless or meddlesome scribe. The truth seems to be that Meed herself was, according to A's conception, a very desirable bride, so much so that her father needed to do nothing to secure a husband for her; False desired her, and Favel, Guile, and Liar (II, 23-25) were the principal agents in making the match. The "feoffment" was not a settlement made by the bride's father—none such was necessary—but a settlement made by the other party, False, Favel, etc., "in consideration of Meed's consent to matrimony"—a common form of settlement, fully discussed in the law-books. Others besides Mr. Jusserand (p. 34) have perhaps been troubled by the fact that in l. 58 the feoffment is represented as made by False (Falseness) and in l. 61 by Favel.¹ But distress on this point might have been relieved by calling to mind that in ll. 37-39 both False and Favel are represented as principals in the matter:

Sir Symonye is of-sent' to asseale the chartres,
That Fals othur Fauvel' by eny fyn heolden,
And feffe Meede therwith' in marriage for evere.

To say, as Mr. Jusserand does (p. 34), that Favel had already been playing the part of father to Meed seems to involve a misconception of A's whole intention; Favel is the friend and helper

¹ The source of the feoffment is even more complicated in B than in A, cf. B, II, 69, 72, 78

of False. The father, Wrong, has no occasion to do anything except affix his signature to the feoffment as first and principal witness.

That B intended to make Favel the father and was prevented from doing so only by a scribe's error¹ is, however, according to Mr. Jusserand, "not a mere surmise, . . . it is a demonstrable fact. The same confusion between these two names, the same use of the one instead of the other, do not occur only in text B, but also in text C, and also in text A itself. . . . In version A, the feoffment is said, in II, 58, to be made by False, and three lines farther on by Favel; False is a mistake for Favel." I have just explained this passage and need say no more. "In version C, we are told," says Mr. Jusserand, "in III, 25, that 'Favel was hure fader,' and on l. 121, that 'Fals were hure fader.'" These statements concerning the C text are accurate as far as they go, but they require a little supplementary examination. The first of the passages, C, II, 25, is taken over from B with no change except the substitution of "Favel" in C for "False" in B. The second passage, C, II, 121, is, on the other hand, an entirely new line, added by C; it runs as follows:

Thouh Fals were hure fader and Fykel-tonge hure syre,
Amendes was hure moder.

Mr. Jusserand requires us to believe either that, after changing "False" to "Favel" in l. 25, C wrote a new line, 121, repeating the error introduced into B, II, 25 (= C, III, 25), not by B, but by a scribe, or that, by some strange fatality, a scribe committed the same error of substitution in C, III, 121 that another scribe had committed twenty-three years earlier in B, II, 25. The attempts to meet my arguments in this and the preceding instance seem to me to involve too many coincidences and to overwork the theory of scribal error. The true explanation of the present instance is, I presume, that in B, II, 25, B carelessly substituted "False" for "Wrong" as the father of Meed, forgetting for the moment that False was the proposed husband; then C, in rewriting B, at first accepted B's conception and

¹ No correction of this supposed scribal error was indicated in Laud 581. Rawl. Poet. 38 does not contain the line.

added C, 121, on this basis, but later, observing the inappropriateness of making False both father and husband of Meed, he (or someone else) substituted "Favel" for "False" in l. 25 but forgot to do the same in l. 121.

But, continues Mr. Jusserand, "the same intention to give Meed a different parentage, better justifying Theology's otherwise ludicrous remarks is also shown by Langland adding in B a mention that Meed had Amendes for her mother, a virtuous character." This has, of course, no real bearing upon the argument we have just completed, and might, if it were true, be admitted without in the least affecting the conclusion we have reached. But it is not so certain that this is an addition by B. Let us see. Professor Skeat's text A, II, 87 reads:

For Meede is a Iuweler · a mayden of goode;

but "Iuweler" is, as Dr. Bradley has pointed out, a misreading of the Vernon MS, instead of some form of "mulier" (i. e., a legitimate child), the same as the "moylere" of text B (of the MSS of the A text T reads *molere*, U *muliere*, D *mulyer*, H *medeler*, H₂ *medlere*); in the second half-line only MSS V and H have the reading of Skeat's text, which is obviously due to the writer of the lost MS from which these two MSS are derived, the other MSS of the A text, i. e., T U H₂ D, read "of frendis engendrit." Now, it will be remembered that the corresponding line in B (l. 118) reads:

For Mede is moylere · of Amendes engendred.

Is it not clear that this was also the original reading of A, distorted in the MS from which all extant MSS of A are derived, and preserved in this distorted form by MSS T H₂ U D but emended for the sake of alliteration (and perhaps, also, of sense) by the immediate source of V and H? Some one may object that I am praying in aid the same sort of scribal interference that I have just refused to recognize when proposed by Mr. Jusserand. I do not think this is the case. I have, of course, never maintained that scribal errors may not disguise the author's intent, but only that Mr. Jusserand's suppositions of scribal error are unsupported by the evidence and involve too many strange coincidences. In

the present case, on the other hand, four of the six MSS quoted by Skeat at this point give a reading which is obviously related in some way to the reading of the B text; so far as I can see, either the reading of the B text was also the reading of the A text and was derived from it, or four MSS of the A text have at this point a reading due to contamination from B. The former supposition seems to be supported by the whole of A's conception of the twofold character of Meed, which was taken over, of course, by B and C. We may, then, safely conclude that "Amendes," the mother, was not added by B, but stood originally in A.¹

3. I asserted that, "in II, 74 ff., B does not understand that the feoffment covers precisely the provinces of the Seven Deadly Sins, and by elaborating the passage spoils the unity of intention." Mr. Jusserand replies that B, not only noted the omission of one of the Sins, but supplied supplementary details without impairing the unity of intention. For my view as to the omitted Sin I must refer to p. 61, below, where it was necessary, for other reasons, to discuss the matter. That the unity of A's intention to cover *precisely* the provinces of the Seven Sins was impaired by B is shown by the fact that B's elaborations are so many and of such a nature as to obscure the fact that precisely seven provinces are in question and not an unsystematic general collection of all the sins the author could think of. I will quote only B's elaborations of the province of Pride (ll. 79-82):

To be prynces in pryde · and poverte to dispise,
To bakbite, and to bosten · and bere fals witesse,
To scorne and to scolde, · and sclandre to make,
Unboxome and bolde · to breke the ten hestes.

Is not the unity of intention somewhat impaired by these elaborations? Indeed, I will go farther and ask whether any student of *Piers Plowman* ever clearly recognized that this feoffment is intended to cover "*precisely* the provinces of the Seven Deadly Sins" before acquaintance with the simpler form of the A text enabled him to perceive the plan overlaid by the elaborations of B and C.

¹This paragraph was written on the basis of the readings given by Skeat, as I had not access to Mr. Knott's collations, and had not seen the excellent discussion of this point by Chambers and Grattan, *Mod. Lang. Rev.* IV, 368, who on the basis of all the MSS reach the same conclusion as I do.

4. I said: "In II, 176, B has forgotten that the bishops are to accompany Meed to Westminster and represents them as borne 'abrode in visytynge.'" Mr. Jusserand replies: "(1) B had no chance to *forget* [italics his] any such thing, as he was, without any doubt, working with a text of A at his elbow." But we have just seen that, even with a text of A at his elbow, B could forget that the leman of Holy Church must not be feminine and that False must not be made the father of the woman he was trying to marry. Continuing his reply he says: "(2) Contrary to what Professor Manly suggests, there is here no incoherency chargeable to B. In A, exactly as in B, Langland indulges in an incidental fling at bishops; no more in one case than in the other were they to go to Westminster at all. In A

For thei schullen beren bisshops · and bringen hem to reste

. . . . may mean anything one pleases, except the implying of a tumultuous journey to Westminster or anywhere else." But I do not understand that the journey to Westminster was to be tumultuous. False was set "on a sysoures backe that softly trotted" (l. 135), "Favel on a fayre speche fetisly atyred" (l. 140), provisions were to be appareled "on palfreis wyse" (l. 148) — these do not sound to me like preparations for a tumultuous journey. "Of Westminster not a word," says Mr. Jusserand. But why should Westminster be mentioned in connection with each member of the party? It had already been distinctly stated as the destination of them all. As well object that Westminster is not mentioned in the lines already cited (ll. 135, 140, 148) or in ll. 146, 147, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157. "Bringen hem to reste" may not state definitely the destination, but it at least is not contradictory of the general plan of a journey to Westminster, as are B, 176:

To here bischopes aboute · abroad in visytynge,

and C, III, 177, 178:

And shope that a shereyve · sholde bere Mede
Softliche in saumbury · fram syse to syse.

In these the journey to Westminster is clearly and unmistakably forgotten for the moment or displaced by another satirical intention.

5. My arguments from the Robert the Robber passage and the Name passage, Mr. Jusserand says he has already answered. And I have replied to his answer (see above, pp. 21 ff.).

VI

His sixth section Mr. Jusserand devotes to some of my stylistic arguments. He says, rightly enough, that most of these I have only mentioned and not developed, and he naturally neglects, as requiring too much space (I suppose), my attempt to indicate the large differences between A and B which occupies pp. 4-17 and 22-28 of my chapter in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*. He does not think very highly of my general exposition of the differences in style, aim, method, interests, and mental peculiarities between A and B as a basis for declaring them to be different men, thinking that I have greatly exaggerated these differences and that, even if taken at my own estimation, they do not justify my conclusion. To reargue this question would be practically to repeat my exposition of the style, aims, method, interests, and mental qualities of each; and I am content to leave the decision to the future, believing, as I confidently do, that it is only necessary that students of *Piers Plowman* shall consider carefully all the manifold differences between the parts of this poem or group of poems to arrive ultimately at the conclusions to which the lucky chance of reading them in the right order has conducted me.

The differences in sentence structure and in versification I must again decline to discuss in detail, partly for lack of space and partly because I have not yet found a method for presenting some of my results that satisfies me. I could without great difficulty give a tabular presentation of statistics that would show striking differences in both of these features. But I am inclined to believe that tabular statements of statistics convince few readers, unless they carry with them some conception capable of more or less definite visualization. I will, therefore, at present only suggest that any reader can convince himself of the differences in sentence structure between A and B by comparing any hundred sentences in B's continuation of the poem (*passus* xi-xx) with any hundred

in A (Prol. and *passus* i-viii) and noting particularly such matters as absolute length, number of co-ordinate clauses, number of subordinate clauses, number of clauses in the second degree of subordination, etc.

As to versification the most striking difference between A and B is that B has a larger number of principal stresses in the half-line than A, and consequently also a larger number of unstressed syllables. An easy mode of presenting the extent of these differences is to represent each half-line by two numbers, that in the unit's place giving the number of stresses and that in the ten's place the number of syllables. First half-lines should of course be kept separate from second half-lines. The average for each half of the line in each text may then easily be obtained.

My statement concerning dialectical differences is so brief that it is perhaps not strange that Mr. Jusserand has misunderstood it. Had I foreseen as even a remote possibility that anyone should suppose that I was thinking of mere scribal variations, I would either have omitted the suggestion altogether or made it clearer. The point I had in mind was that it is possible to determine by well-known philological processes the forms of certain words in the original copies of the several versions. If we find, for example, that no instance of "are" occurs in A1 and that instances occur in A2, which, because they are essential to the alliteration, clearly proceed from the author and not from a scribe, we are justified in concluding, even if the texts of A2 contain also instances of "ben," that, in all probability, A2 used "are" and A1 did not. If we find that in B "she" is, according to the evidence of all extant MSS, the form of this pronoun in the source from which they are all derived, and that in A "heo" is, according to the evidence of all extant MSS, the corresponding form, we are justified in concluding that, in all probability the authors of the two versions differed as to the form of this pronoun. There still remains, of course, a possibility that the common source of the extant MSS of each version was not the author's original and differed from it in dialect. But if we can show further that the B text contains readings (of "he" for "she") based upon "heo" in the earlier text, we have confirmation of the evidence which points to "heo" as the

form used in the earlier text. Such instances occur. In A, III, 30, e. g., all the MSS have:

Handeliche thenne heo behihte hem the same,
and B has the same form "heo," in spite of the fact that "she" is the regular form in B for the feminine pronoun. Three MSS, indeed, C O B, have "she," but they form a small subgroup and "she" is clearly due to a correction in their immediate source. "We find as great differences between the various copies of the same version" as between the different versions, says Mr. Jusserand. Of course. Two scribes may differ as much as two authors; and the same differences which in the one case oblige us to conclude that the scribes are different men oblige us in the other to conclude that the authors are different men. Naturally it is not always easy to discover what forms were actually used by an author, but when these can be discovered, the conclusions are not hard to draw. In the case of *Piers Plowman* many dialectical questions must remain unsettled until we have a complete record of all readings, even those heretofore regarded as insignificant.¹

With Mr. Jusserand's general attitude toward metrical questions, as expressed on p. 38, I find myself unable to agree. It is true that there are differences in versification between *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* and between *Love's Labour's Lost* and *The Tempest*, but the verse of both the former is characteristically Miltonic and that of the latter two characteristically Shakspearean. Mr. Jusserand would certainly admit that pieces of verse might be submitted for his judgment, which, on the evidence of versification alone, he could without hesitation pronounce to be not the work of either Milton or Shakspeare. And even if the differences between A and B be not so great as in this supposed case, they are at least worth noting as a part of the general argument concerning these two versions. The force of a large

¹ That the readings of other MSS than V of the A text must be taken into consideration in determining any point of A's style or language seems too obvious to require special statement, but Messrs. Chambers and Grattan, *loc. cit.*, p. 358, have strangely inferred that I regard the Vernon MS as the A text. That I have never entertained such an idea, if it does not appear from what I myself have written, as I think it does, is indicated by the fact, known to Dr. Furnivall and others, that Mr. T. A. Knott has, at my suggestion, been working for the past two years upon a critical text of the A version, the materials for which he collected in England and Ireland in the summer of 1907. As for myself, I have always tried to take into consideration the readings and relations of all the accessible MSS, and I venture to hope that no important statement made by me will be nullified by the critical text, when it appears.

number of important differences between two works cannot be broken by showing that each difference has been found in works undoubtedly by one author.

My praise of A and my emphasis of his possession of certain qualities lacking in the work of B seem to have misled Mr. Jusserand. I have nowhere declared "the first part of A the best in the whole work;" I have nowhere put it "so far above the rest as to imply a difference of authorship." I have re-echoed and quoted with the heartiest approval Mr. Jusserand's just and fine words about the merits of B, and I quoted several of the very finest specimens of B's powers (see *Camb. Hist. Engl. Lit.*, II, 28, 29), among them one so fine that Mr. Jusserand quotes it against me (p. 46) as if it upset my whole case. My argument is not at all concerned with the superiority of one version over another, but with the differences between them, differences which seem to me not superficial and shifting, but dependent upon innate and fairly permanent mental qualities and endowments.

In reply to my indications of differences in methods and interests between A and his continuators Mr. Jusserand exclaims, "Why not?" and "Again, why not?" I freely admit that no man is obliged to follow the same method of allegory all his life, but if we find such obvious attempts at the method of A as we do find at the beginning of A2 and of B's continuation (*passus xi*) we are justified in believing that A2 and B tried to use A's allegorical method and could not. But A2 and B both exhibit an interest in predestination and are thereby brought "near" to one another, says Mr. Jusserand. If an interest in predestination were excessively rare, this might indeed be of some importance, but I have already pointed out, I think, that in consequence of Bradwardine's *De Causa Dei* predestination was one of the chief topics of interest to serious-minded men in the fourteenth century (*Camb. Hist. Engl. Lit.*, II, 18). It is of more consequence that C seems to believe in astrology (C, XV, 30), whereas A2 and B apparently reject this and similar sciences (see A, XI, 152 ff.; B, X, 209 ff., and note that C omits the passage).

In order to show that A is as incoherent as B, Mr. Jusserand gives an outline of A, *passus i*, and the outline is certainly inco-

herent to the last degree. But any man's work will appear incoherent in an outline that omits the links of his thought. "The Lady answers, in substance: The tower on this toft is the place of abode of Truth, or God the father; but do not get drunk," runs the outline. Shall we supply the missing links? Instead of making a new outline *ad hoc*, I will quote from the one I gave in the *Camb. Hist. Engl. Lit.* (II, 6): "The tower, she explains, is the dwelling of Truth, the Father of our faith, who formed us all and commanded the earth to serve mankind with all things needful. He has given food and drink and clothing to suffice for all, but to be used with moderation, for excess is sinful and dangerous to the soul." Is this incoherent? Does it not furnish a sufficient reply—if one is unwilling to consult the original—to the questions which Mr. Jusserand asks, upon the heels of the sentence just quoted from him: "Why drunk, and why all those details about drunkenness that caused Lot's sins . . . ?" The dreamer's question about money and Holy Church's reply Mr. Jusserand calls "equally unexpected and irrelevant." Surely it is not difficult to see why the dreamer, having learned that God's gifts to his human creatures are food, drink, and clothing, should inquire about money. The question was not irrelevant, nor, to one familiar with mediaeval discussion, ought it to be unexpected.¹

The rest of the outline is of the same character. There is no incoherency or confusion in the author's thought. I invite the reader to compare the outline given by Mr. Jusserand and that given by me in the *Camb. Hist. Engl. Lit.* (II, 7) with the original and decide for himself whether the strictures are justified. Mr. Jusserand may have missed the connection by accepting the reading of the Vernon MS in A, I, 92:

Kynges and knihtes · sholde kepen *hem* bi reson.

But all the other MSS (H, T, H2, U, D) read "it" for "hem," and the antecedent of "it" is "truth." If this connection is once lost, the text seems indeed hopelessly incoherent. As MS H belongs to the same group as MS V, it is clear that "hem" is an unauthorized variant, like many in this MS.

¹ Mr. Jusserand thinks that the vision of the field full of folk was "nothing else than . . . the world as represented in a mystery play, just as we may see it pictured in the MS of the Valenciennes Passion." Where in *England* could the author have seen such a stage?

At the end of my discussion of the first vision, that is, at the end of *passus* iv, I remarked: "Only once or twice does the author interrupt his narrative to express his own views or feelings." This, says Mr. Jusserand, is "remarkably exaggerated," and he triumphantly cites III, 55, III, 84, VII, 306, VIII, 62, and VIII, 168, saying: "Here are, in any case, five examples instead of 'one or two.'" I submit that, in the vision to which my statement applied, there are only two. And I further submit—though I have just shown that my statement was not "remarkably exaggerated"—that neither VIII, 168 ff., which comes among the reflections and admonitions *after* the awaking on Malvern Hills, nor VII, 306 ff., which comes at a distinct pause in the action, marked by a formal division of the poem, nor VIII, 62, 63, a brief exclamatory demand for confirmation of an assertion, interrupts the narrative; and, finally, that none of these is at all comparable to the constant interruptions and excursions of B.

Mr. Jusserand quotes me as saying "that there is nowhere in A 'even the least hint of any personal animosity against any class of men as a class;'" and replies that in this he sees no great differences between any of the Visions, and that, as a matter of fact, the friars, like the lawyers, are condemned wholesale. It seems to me that Mr. Jusserand has not quite understood me. In the first place, I did not assert or even suggest that there was any difference between the authors (or Visions) in this respect. In the second place, the paragraph from which the quoted words are taken (*Camb. Hist. Engl. Lit.*, II, 11) implied a distinction between satire touching whole classes or groups of men and personal animosity against a class as a class. I thought this distinction was clearly implied, but perhaps it was not. I shall be obliged to the reader if he will refer to the paragraph and read the whole of it; here I will quote only two sentences: "The satire proper begins with *passus* ii, and, from there to the end of this vision [i. e., to the end of *passus* iv], is devoted to a single subject—Meed and the confusion and distress which, because of her, afflict the world. Friars, merchants, the clergy, justices, lawyers, all classes of men, indeed, are shown to be corrupted by love of Meed; but, contrary to current opinion, there is nowhere even the least

hint of any personal animosity against any class of men as a class, or against any of the established institutions of church or state."

In two paragraphs on p. 44 Mr. Jusserand strives to establish identity of authorship by various incidental remarks. He thinks that, in making additions to A 1, B writes like A 1, and in expanding A 2, writes like A 2. But I do not admit either proposition. The additions to A 1 are more like A 1 than are those to A 2, as would inevitably occur with any writer capable of being influenced by the nature of the work which he was expanding or elaborating, but this, I think, is as far as Mr. Jusserand's claim can be admitted. B makes picturesque additions to A 1, but, with perhaps a single exception, they bear little resemblance to the work of A 1; and he is discursive in his development of the theme of A 2, but lacks the dry pedantry of that writer, and possesses a command of picturesqueness and passion of which A 2 is incapable.

"One may be permitted," says Mr. Jusserand, "to ask what is the crowd which B ought to have described, and which he failed to visualize?" Surely the reply is not far to seek. Either the champions of Antichrist in *passus* xx or the forgotten host assembled by Pride in *passus* xix.

Aside from some matters to which I have already replied, the rest of Section VI is occupied with attempts to show that A 2 and B are capable of occasional passages of beauty or power. I have never questioned this. Here I will only call attention to the curious fact that the specific passages cited by Mr. Jusserand, fine as they are, were apparently not appreciated by C. For example,

Percen with a *pater noster* · the paleis of hevene (A, XI, 362)

though only a translation of *Brevis oratio penetrat coelum*, is happily phrased and worthy of admiration and preservation. What does C do with it? He rewrites it thus:

Persen with a *pater noster* · paradys other hevene,—

which somehow lacks quality, distinction. Again, the fine poetic cry cited by me in illustration of B's power of vivid expression, and repeated by Mr. Jusserand, can indeed hardly be cited too often or praised too highly:

Ac pore peple, thi prisoneres, · Lorde, in the put of myschief,
 Conforte tho creatures · that moche care suffren
 Thorw derth, thorw drouth · alle her dayes here,
 Wo in wynter tymes · for wanting of clothes,
 And in somer tyme selde · soupen to the fulle;
 Conforte thi careful, · Cryst, in thi ryche!—B, XIV, 174 ff.

Would you not expect the man who had written those lines to preserve them—improved, of course, if they can be improved—in any revision or any number of revisions that he might make of his poem? Would you not really? But what does C do? He replaces them by some lines beginning with

Ac for the beste, as ich hope · aren somme poure and some riche
 (C, XVII, 21 ff.)

and continuing with a prayer that God amend us all and make us meek and send us *cordis contritio, oris confessio, and operis satisfactio*. The whole passage from l. 20 to l. 37 is entirely out of harmony with the corresponding passage in B, and significant of the different attitudes of the two writers toward the poor. And this is only one of many similar instances.

Mr. Jusserand thinks that C greatly improved the episode of the pardon by suppressing "the lines telling, in previous versions, how Piers tore up his bull of pardon out of spite and simply because contradiction had irritated him." If this were, indeed, the motive of Piers's action, the suppression of it would doubtless be an improvement. But I do not so interpret the passage; "for puire teone" does not here mean "for spite and because contradiction had irritated him," but "out of grief and disappointment." He had what he supposed to be a pardon, but the priest who offered to construe it and explain it in English, read it and declared it to be no pardon at all. What more natural than that, in the first impulse of distress and disappointment, he should tear the supposedly lying document? It is only later ("siththe," l. 101) that he recovers and comforts himself with, *Si ambulavero in medio umbre mortis, non timebo mala, quoniam tu mecum es*.

But even if the suppression had to be made, what shall we think of a writer who suppresses the whole discussion between Piers and the priest and continues with the line,

The preest *thus* and Perkin · of the pardon jangled,
 which is nonsense after the suppression of the jangling?

I should also like to know the meaning of B, VII, 168 (C, X, 318),

And how the prest preved · no pardon to Dowel.

The priest certainly had not proved or asserted that no pardon was equal to Dowel. The line looks very much as if it were due to a mistake as to the meaning of A, VIII, 156. Ll. 155, 156 read:

And hou the preost impugned hit · al by pure resoun,
And divinede that Dowel · indulgence passede.

B and C apparently thought "preost" was the subject of "divinede," whereas the subject is, of course, "I," implied in "me" of l. 152.

VII

Section VII, briefer than the others, is devoted to an attack upon some of my evidence that C is a different person from B. Mr. Jusserand is not much impressed by my arguments. He is not certain that C spoiled the picture of the field full of folk (Prol. 11-16) and regards the broadening of the spectacle by the line,

Al the welthe of this worlde · and the woo bothe,

as something we could hardly afford to lose. My own feeling is that this line does not add one whit to the sweep of the poet's vision and that the writer who regarded it as necessary or even desirable to add such a line was fundamentally not a poet but a topographer.

Again—to my great surprise, I confess—Mr. Jusserand contends that C did not misunderstand the passage in the Rat Parliament about the creatures that wear collars about their necks and "run in warren and in waste." These were not, in the surface meaning, dogs, he asserts, but men, knights and squires. That in the ultimate intention they were men is no doubt true, just as the rats and mice were men and the cat and kitten a king and a prince. But this is a beast fable. What have men to do in it, among the rats and mice and cat and kitten? And, above all, why the warren and the waste? Do men run uncoupled in rabbit warrens and waste fields? No: in the allegory of B these were

dogs, and it needed the prosaic, literal spirit of C to turn them into "great sires, both knights and squires." I may remark parenthetically that I have found no other version of the fable which throws any light upon the question by mentioning these creatures, but the text of the B version is unmistakable.

If the differences of C from his predecessors could be accounted for by the supposition of advancing age, I should never have felt it necessary to suggest that he and B were not the same person. I have not striven to see how much the authorship of these poems could be divided. On the contrary, it would have been much simpler and easier if B and C could have been admitted to be one and the same person, and it was long before I was willing to divide the work of the A text and ascribe it to different authors. Mr. Jusserand seems to argue that, because C has some qualities sometimes possessed by old men (but also often by young men), he must be old, and that there are no differences between him and B that cannot be explained by this supposition. Where he gets his notion that A seems younger than B, I do not know.

"At times," I remarked, "one is tempted to think that passages were rewritten for the mere sake of rewriting." "Just so," replies Mr. Jusserand, "and who, except the author himself, would take so much trouble?" Is it to the author, then, that we owe the variants of the Lincoln's Inn MS of A, or MSS Camb. Univ. Ff. 5, 35 and Harl. 2376 of C? Or why should the author be more ready than another to make alterations which are not improvements but mere futile variations? Of the parallel supposed to be afforded by Ronsard I can say nothing, for I have not examined the revisions he made in his text, but I shall discuss below some of Mr. Jusserand's other parallels. It will be remembered, of course, that I based no argument as to difference of authorship upon the general character of the textual changes made by C.

Mr. Jusserand's explanation of the error of A 2 in regard to *non mecaberis* and *tabescebam* is ingenious, but hardly convincing. That A 2 should think of *mactabis* and *tacebam* when he had to translate the other words hardly relieves him of the

charge of inaccurate scholarship. What is the usual cause of mistranslation but this? As to B, he did not "notice one of these *misprints* [italics Mr. Jusserand's] and forget the other," as Mr. Jusserand thinks: he simply omitted the whole passage containing *tabescebam*. "If one of the versions had shown minute accuracy throughout, that would have told, in a way, for the theory of multiple authorship," says Mr. Jusserand. This I think we find in A 1.

VIII

The whole of the eighth section is devoted to a plea that even if "the differences between the three versions" be taken at my own estimate, they can prove nothing, for similar differences exist between works known to be by the same author. Chaucer's tales of the Clerk, the Miller, and the Parson are cited. But surely Mr. Jusserand does not contend that such difficulties exist in supposing that the tales of the Clerk and the Miller are by the same writer as I have shown to exist in the case of *Piers Plowman*. As for the *Parson's Tale*, the thought, the composition, the style, is, as I have said, not Chaucer's; other men wrote it, he merely turned it into English, without giving it any of his individuality. *Hamlet*, again, presents no such similarities as are suggested; "fat and asthmatic" is hardly a fair rendering of "fat and scant of breath" when applied to a fencer, and, at the very time when these words were uttered, the fair Ophelia, if she had been alive, would doubtless still have thought Hamlet "slim and elegant," if we may use Mr. Jusserand's terms. The supposed contradictions in *Hamlet* are all of the same nature as Shakspeare's treatment of time-indications, a matter of momentary impression for dramatic purposes, as I have explained in my introduction to *Macbeth*. There are troublesome features in *Hamlet*, perhaps traces of an earlier hand, but nothing to indicate that the play should be divided as Mr. Jusserand suggests.

The cases of Montaigne, Cervantes, and Milton are, in my opinion, not at all parallel to ours. Milton and certain aspects of the Cervantes and Montaigne arguments I have already discussed. As for the rest, it may safely be asserted that if the

1588 edition of the *Essais* or the second part of *Don Quixote* had appeared anonymously, the style would in each case have led us to ascribe them to their true authors. The changes in Tasso's *Gerusalemme Conquistata* I have examined with some care. I find, somewhat to my surprise, that, although by no means so interesting as the *Liberata*, because of the exclusion of many episodes and the systematic assimilation of the heroes to antique models, the revision is not "the work obviously of a feebler hand," but, on the contrary, usually richer and more powerful in style, more concise and more packed with meaning. The current opinion I believe to be due solely to the disappointment critics have felt at the loss of the episodes which Tasso rejected as out of harmony with his new purpose and to their disapproval of his classicizing tendency.

Robinson Crusoe I have not read since about 1891, I think, but my recollection is that the superior interest of the first part is due, not to the style, but to the unique and moving situation which forms the subject of the book. It, like the later parts, is full of moralizations and religious reflections. The later parts fail to hold the reader mainly because their theme fails to grip either the reader or the author himself.

Mr. Jusserand warns us that if my methods are adopted, the whole history of literature will have to be rewritten. This warning is not unfamiliar; we have heard its like from the housetops on almost every occasion when a new truth in literary history, in science, or in social, political, or economic science, has been announced. And it has almost always had a measure of truth in it. Not all things, but some, have often had to be re-examined and re-explained or restated. But, even though I recognize all this and find comfort in it, I might still be alarmed at the wide possibilities suggested by Mr. Jusserand if I were indeed the first to thrust out my tiny boat upon this "South Sea of discovery." But as I understand the matter, I occupy no such position of danger and honor. I am merely a humble follower in paths of science long known and well charted. The history of literature has been rewritten very largely, and rewritten to no small degree by precisely the same methods that I have employed. And

unless human energy flags and men become content to accept the records of the past at their face value and in their superficial meaning, many another ancient error will take its place in the long list of those which could not bear the light of historical and critical research.

Shall I make a list of the achievements of my predecessors? It is not necessary. *Quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?* Every reader can make for himself a list that will abundantly support my courage. And, curiously enough, more than one list will contain, among the names of those to whom such achievements are due, the name of Mr. Jusserand himself.

IX

To the arguments for unity of authorship recalled at the beginning of Section IX I have already replied, and shown them to be unsound. The new "connecting link" is also too weak to sustain even its own weight.

The versions are bound together, Mr. Jusserand asserts, by hints about the author, his thoughts, and his manner of life. That the figure of the dreamer, once conceived, should be continued along essentially the same lines by anyone sufficiently in sympathy to wish to add to the poem, need occasion no surprise, even if the early figure were more definite and the continuations more consistent than they are. As for the localities, upon which so much stress is laid, the Malvern Hills are, no doubt, a locality with which A1 had special associations of some sort, but they have apparently no special significance for the other writers. Moreover, definiteness of localization, not unknown in other satirical poems, is not so marked a feature of all these visions as Mr. Jusserand implies. A's visions occur on Malvern Hills, A2's beside some unnamed wood. In C, VI, 1, the dreamer who had gone to sleep on the Malvern Hills apparently awakes in Cornhill, though it is of course possible to contend that this line is not a note of place but of time. B (and C) falls asleep while already asleep, B, XI, 1; awakes at some indefinite place, XI, 396, but meets and talks with Ymaginatyf, XI, 400—XII, 293; awakes again (in an unnamed place), XIII, 1; sleeps again, XIII, 21, and wakes, XIV,

332; is rocked to sleep by Resoun, XV, 11, and, while talking with Anima, swoons and lies in a long dream, XVI, 19—an absurdity omitted by C; awakes, *ibid.*, 167—not in C—and on Midlent Sunday meets Abraham or Faith, XVI, 172 ff., Spes, XVII, 1, and the Samaritan, or Christ, *ibid.*, 48 (cf. 107); awakes again, *ibid.*, 350; leans to a “lenten” and sleeps, XVIII, 5, and awakes, apparently in his cot in Cornhill, on Easter morning, *ibid.*, 424; in spite of the interest of the day, he falls asleep during Mass, XIX, 4; awakes and writes what he has dreamed, *ibid.*, 478; meets Need and converses with him, XX, 1; falls asleep, *ibid.*, 50; and, finally, awakes again, *ibid.*, 384. I have given in this *résumé* all the definite localizations of the dreams both as to time and as to place. If definiteness is the characteristic of A’s work, it clearly is not of B’s. C alters the framework so little that no conclusion can be drawn. The dozen or so places and things in and about London that are mentioned indicate, of course, some familiarity with London, but considering the importance of London and the number of its inhabitants, do not oblige us to assume unity of authorship, if there is any evidence against it.

The personal notes common to all the visions upon which Mr. Jusserand insists are in reality singularly few.

On the question of the increasing age of the successive authors (or the single author), which Mr. Jusserand again raises, I have already spoken. There is nothing to indicate that A 1 or A 2 is younger than B, or that B is younger than C. He cites the well-known passage, B, XII, 3 ff., to prove that the poet “has reached middle age, though not yet old age.” In B, XX, 182 ff., however, we learn that B has been overrun by old age (Eld) and has lost hair, teeth, hearing, and vigor, and that, because of age, Death draws near him. Of course it is easy to contend that many years elapsed between the composition of B, XII, and B, XX; but the truth probably is that we cannot construct the chronology of any of these poets from the hints given in the poems. “The minute care” as to chronology which Mr. Jusserand finds so extraordinary in these poems does not exist in reality. Professor Jack showed long ago how vaguely numbers are used (*Journ. Germ. Phil.*, III, 393–403). A good example is that cited by Mr. Jusserand as an

instance of minute care. C changes the "fyve and fourty wyntre" of B, XII, 3, to "more than fourty wyntre." If approximate accuracy were desired, would not "fyve and syxty wyntre" have been better?

Turning from these insignificant details, we find that Mr. Jusserand objects to my view that Kitte and Kalote are not to be taken literally as the names of the author's wife and daughter. He says that Kitte was not always a name of unpleasant import—which is perfectly true, of course—and he declares that the opprobrious meaning attributed to the names at that date is a mere assumption for which no proof is adduced. Now, my point is that *both* names have unpleasant suggestions. Had Kitte been used alone, I should have thought nothing of its import, but Kitte and Kalote together here are as unmistakable as Kyt calot in John Heywood's *Dialogue of Proverbs* (I, xi, 181).¹ Mr. Jusserand asks me to note that "the oldest example quoted in Murray's *Dictionary* of 'callet' being used to designate a 'lewd woman, trull, strumpet, drab,' is of about 1500." It is more important to note that this is the earliest meaning; and that the milder meaning is more easily derived from this than this from that. The Heywood and More passages will relieve us of the need of arguing the question whether "Kalote" and "callet" are the same word. So far as the opprobrious meaning of Kitte in the fourteenth century is concerned, I did not think it necessary to produce the evidence formally; in *Piers Plowman*, C, VIII, 300 ff., Actif says:

Ich have ywedded a wyf · wel wantowen of maners;
Were ich sevenyght fro hure syghte · synnen hue wolde;

Ich may nat come for a Kytte, · so hue cleueth on me.

I do not feel at all bound to explain why these names were chosen or why they were used in the passage where the dreamer (the author, Mr. Jusserand calls him) is awakened by the bells on Easter morn. It may be that he used the names loosely (= those poor dirty sinful creatures) for the sake of securing the sort of contrast of which he seems so fond and which he developed so

¹ Cf. also, "Frere Luther and Cate calate his nunne lye luskyn together in lechery," More, *Confut. Tindale*, Wks. 423/2, in *Oxf. Dict.* s. v. "callet."

remarkably in the figure of the dreamer, as Mr. Jusserand showed long ago in his brilliant and charming book on these poems. But there are many vagaries of B and C that I cannot explain. Even in connection with this Resurrection morn there is another that puzzles me. Why should the dreamer who has awakened so impressively at the sound of the Easter bells and bidden Kitte and Kalote creep to the cross—why should he, when he has dight him dearly and gone to church to hear the mass and be houseled after, fall asleep at the offertory, as he does in B, XIX, 5? “The answer of this,” in the words of Chaucer, “I lete to dyvynes.”

I referred to Professor Jack's article (cited above) as having proved conclusively that the supposed autobiographical details, given mainly by B and C, are mere parts of the fiction. Upon the basis of this Mr. Jusserand wishes to hold me responsible for every phrase of Professor Jack's article—some of which seem to me a little less definite than the admirable argument justifies—and also to make the curious inference that, because Professor Jack and I think that the dreamer and his career are a part of the fiction, and cannot be safely used to reconstruct the author's life, we are therefore committed to the position that the creators of this dreamer carefully excluded from their work every item of personal experience. Surely we are not so committed. Most fictions are in some way—not always ascertainable—based upon the writer's experience and observation. But even if one were told, in the case of a given fiction that 25 per cent. of it was true, it would be difficult, in the absence of other evidence, to separate the truth from the fiction; and in the present instance we have no means of determining what events are given literally, what are the results of observation and hearsay, and what are experience transformed beyond recognition. That Rabelais knew some of the places of which he wrote and among which he made his characters move is true enough, but does Mr. Jusserand maintain that every place Rabelais mentioned belonged to his own experience and that his biography could be written by transcribing the movements of Pantagruel or Gargantua or Panurge?

Mr. Jusserand is mistaken, I think, in believing that Professor Jack himself felt any misgivings in regard to his results.

What Mr. Jusserand takes as such are to be interpreted in the sense of the paragraph which precedes this. Professor Jack's expressions are too definite and explicit to admit of any doubt on this point when read in their entirety.

We do indeed know many of the hopes and fears, the interests and the ideals of the authors of these poems. This is not their biography, but it is far more important. The significance and importance of the poems lies not in the question whether the name William Langland can be definitely associated with them or not, nor in the question whether one or more of the authors was born or educated among the Malvern Hills and lived in Cornhill in later years, but in the fact that these hopes and ideals were cherished in the fourteenth century by men who gave them such expression as commanded the attention of many men of that time and still has power to kindle our imaginations and stir our hearts after the lapse of five centuries. For my own part, I find it especially significant, as I have before said, that more than one man was moved by these ideals and wrought upon these powerful poems.

X

This were a wikked way but who-so hadde a gyde,
was the cry of the bewildered pilgrims, as they set out to seek Truth. Many readers of this discussion may feel that the way is even "wikkeder" with two guides, like Mr. Jusserand and myself, each pulling them in different directions and confidently recommending his route, not only as safer and better but as the only one that leads to the shining Tower. I can only hope that all who have followed me are not only content at the end of the long and tedious journey, but recognize that upon Mr. Jusserand's way many of the bridges which are fairest in outward seeming are really unsafe structures with a crumbling keystone, that pitfalls lie concealed beneath some of the most attractive stretches of his road, and, finally, that it leads them into a "no-thoroughfare" from which the confiding traveler must turn back and seek painfully the plain highway which he abandoned, under the influence of Mr. Jusserand's eloquence, for the soft but dangerous by-paths.

JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY

A TERMINAL NOTE ON THE LOST LEAF

I had hoped to be able to keep the discussion of authorship—the fundamental question—from being complicated by the entirely subordinate question as to whether Mr. Bradley or I (or, I may add, Mr. Jusserand) had offered the most probable explanation of the way in which the confusion (and loss) occurred. And because it is in reality a matter which does not affect the fundamental question, I have never replied to Mr. Bradley's letter in the *Athenaeum*. As, however, Mr. Jusserand dismisses my view with a word and finds some support for his own in one feature of Mr. Bradley's, I will present here briefly my reasons for still preferring my view to Mr. Bradley's.

And first, I will state the objections against my view as I understand them. Mr. Bradley, in his letter said only that "it leaves us still under the necessity of supposing that, after relating in succession the confessions of the seven sins, he [the poet] introduced at the end a new penitent, whose offenses, according to mediaeval classification, belong to one of the branches of Covetousness;" but he would doubtless assent to the view held by Mr. Jusserand and by him credited also to Mr. Bradley (it is, indeed, implicit in Mr. Bradley's objection) that "no conceivable lost passage with lines making a transition from Sloth to Robert the Robber could be at all satisfactory." Dr. Furnivall has, in our talks on the subject, given as a reason for preferring Mr. Bradley's view to mine, that the loss of an inner double leaf, as supposed by me, could hardly occur.

To the second and first objections I would reply that I think we could safely trust the original author to write in sixty-two lines (the number missing according to my hypothesis) a thoroughly satisfactory transition from the personifications of the Sins to Robert the Robber and the "thousent of men" that "throngen togedere," weeping and wailing and crying upward to Christ, with which the *passus* ends; and one might expect him to introduce at the close of this scene concrete single figures before returning to the crowd, just as at the beginning of the scene, he had introduced between the mention of the "field ful of folk" and the Sins such figures as Thomas (l. 28), Felice (29), Watte and his wife (30), merchants (32),

priests and prelates (34), monks and friars (37) Wille, or William, as two MSS have it,¹ (44) and Pernel Proudheart (45), who from being purely concrete in l. 26 has become half abstract and transitional. Mr. Jusserand says rightly in another place (p. 21) that "the six lines [preceding the name of Robert the Robber] cannot be properly attached, such as they are, to any part of the poem, neither where they stand in A and B nor where the confession of Coveitise ends," which he and Mr. Bradley think is their real place. And he thinks that no one but the author could "imagine what single [additional] verse can make sense of that nonsense." I do not agree with him that C succeeded in doing this, but after finding, as he thinks he has found, that an author can make in a single line a connection inconceivable by anyone but himself, how can he maintain that with sixty-two lines in which to accomplish his task, an author of genius could not make a transition the precise nature of which we cannot now conceive? Sixty-two lines is much. Give a writer like A sixty-two lines and you make him a king of infinite space: the wide vision of the Prologue is accomplished in less than twice this amount. With regard to Dr. Furnivall's objection I will say that, although it is perhaps not very easy for a sewn MS to lose any of its inner leaves, yet such losses do occur, and not infrequently. I will cite only three instances. MS Dd. 3. 13 of the Camb. Univ. Lib. besides lacking some leaves at the beginning and the end has two gaps, says Professor Skeat (Vol. III, p. xliii), viz., XIV, 227—XV, 40 and XVI, 288—XVII, 41. I calculated that these gaps were caused by a single loss, that of the outside pair of a quire of eight. In reply to my inquiry upon this point, Dr. Jenkinson writes: "The two leaves missing are, as you surmise, the outside pair of a quire of eight; viz., h1 and h8." But this may not be accepted as a good parallel, as the leaves are an outer pair, although the quire is an inner quire and as such would be well protected under ordi-

¹ But for the later developments of the A2, B, and C texts, no one, probably, would take this "Wille" or that in A, VIII, 43 for the author. These are no doubt the basis for the later developments, but I would point out: (1) that the author does not elsewhere in A speak of himself in the third person; (2) that, although Will copies the pardon in A, VIII, 43, 44, the author peeps over the shoulders of Piers and the priest fifty lines further on (l. 93) in order to see what it contains; (3) that in V, 44 Will apparently belongs to the same category of definitely named but otherwise unknown figures as Thomas and Felice and Watte.

nary circumstances. In the *Castle of Perseverance* the loss of the next to the outside pair of leaves of the second quire (i. e., B₂) has caused two gaps, pointed out and discussed by Mr. Pollard (*The Macro Plays*, pp. xxxi f.). This is an inner pair of leaves and their loss would have been no more difficult if they had stood next to the innermost instead of next to the outermost pair.

Furthermore, as Mr. Knott points out to me, the immediate source of three *Piers Plowman* MSS (Rawl. Poet. 137, Univ. Coll. Oxf., and Trin. Coll. Dubl.) was a MS in which A, VII, 71-216 (less four lines) was misplaced. These 142 lines obviously occupied a single sheet, that is, either the two pages of a single leaf or the four pages of a double leaf which was the innermost of a quire. The latter seems the more likely, not only because MSS of about 36 lines to the page are commoner than those of 71, but also because, if the MS from which R U T₂ are derived be conceived as having about 36 lines to a page, the transferred passage will actually occupy the innermost double leaf of the third quire, supposing the quires to be made up of 4 double leaves or 16 pages. Apparently, therefore, the innermost leaf of a *Piers Plowman* MS was, in this instance, lost from its place.

The objections to my view seem, therefore, not serious. I prefer it to Mr. Bradley's, because, in the first place, it is simpler to account for both gaps, as I have done, by a single loss than to suppose, as Mr. Bradley does, that some loose sheets containing Wrath (and the end of Envy) were lost and the one containing Robert the Robber misplaced. Mr. Bradley's view makes it necessary to suppose that the author was prevented by some cause (perhaps death before the completion of the MS) from revising the copy made by the scribe. A scribe putting an author's work into book form from loose sheets would be more likely to be on his guard against getting a sheet in the wrong place than one who was copying a supposedly well-arranged book would be against a possible gap in his original; and no scribe thus on his guard would ever have thought of joining this Robert the Robber passage to Sloth. If he did not know where it belonged, he would probably put it under Coveitise, as C and Mr. Bradley and Mr. Jusserand

have done, in spite of the fact that, as it stands, it cannot be joined to Coveitise, and that no other Sin has two representatives. The very fact that the first impulse of every one is to refer this passage to Coveitise, combined with the facts that it was not put there by the scribe and cannot in its present form be put there by anyone, should teach us that this first impulse is wrong and that our theory must account not only for the existence of the passage but also for its present place in the MS.

Having explained, and I hope justified, my unwillingness to assent to Mr. Jusserand's assumption that Mr. Bradley has shown my theory of the manner in which the two faults in A, V occurred to be untenable, I wish to repeat that this is merely an incidental question, not fundamental to this discussion. Professor C. F. Brown in a letter to the *New York Nation* (Vol. LXXXVIII, pp. 298 f.; March 25, 1909) repeats independently a suggestion made by Mr. T. D. Hall in the *Modern Language Review* (Vol. IV, p. 1, Oct., 1908) that the whole difficulty in the Robert the Robber passage can be remedied by placing ll. 236-41 between l. 253 and l. 254. I do not see how it is possible for 236, 237 to follow 237, 238.¹ If Robert had not "wher-with," of what avail would be his conditional promise of restitution? In regard to the absence of Wrath from the territories of the Charter, II, 60-74, I may note that the MS from which all extant texts of A are derived already contained some errors. Like Professor Brown, I was at first disturbed by the recognition that the accidental absence of Wrath here and in *passus v* would be a curious coincidence, but I reflected that it would be very difficult to suggest a reason why the author should wish to omit Wrath; to be sure New Guise proclaims in *Mankind*, 699, the joyful news, "There arn but sex dedly synnys" (cf. also *Bannatyne MS*, p. 483), but he made a different omission, and we can guess his reasons. And if the author had no reason, but made the omissions accidentally, we still have the coincidence. But as Mr. Bradley says, it is incredible that a serious writer in the Middle Ages should omit any of the sins by forgetfulness.

May I here correct a misapprehension into which Professor Brown and some others have fallen, viz., that it was the theory of

¹I see that Mr. Bradley has already made this point in his letter to the *Nation*, April 29, discussing Professor Brown's theory.

the "lost leaf" that led me "to re-examine the relation of the revised texts to the original form of the poem." On the contrary, as I stated in the first paragraph of my paper on the "Lost Leaf," it was in the summer of 1904 that I began to re-examine the relations of the texts and to feel that the stylistic differences were such as to make it hard to believe that they were the work of one man. In 1905 I undertook to study the relations of the texts with a class of graduate students and in the course of that study the theory of the "lost leaf" suggested itself as the most probable explanation of the confusion at A, V, 235, 236. My first thought was that a leaf had been skipped in copying at this point. Then I remembered the omission of Wrath from the Confessions, which, accompanied as it was by the similar omission of it from the Charter, had puzzled us sorely. The possibility of a single loss of a pair of leaves suggested itself as accounting for the two large faults; I made some calculations to see if the missing leaves would be parts of the same leaf, and found that they might. Several explanations of the difficulties had previously been canvassed both privately and in the classroom. I make this explanation not because I regard it as important that the actual order of my mental processes should be known, but because it seems to me that the striking character of the argument in regard to the "lost leaf" and other failures of B and C to understand their predecessors has fixed our attention too much on these external matters and too little on the very important questions of style, sentence structure, versification, visualization, use of imagery, interests, social and theological views, etc. I am perhaps as much to blame for this as anyone else, for I have merely indicated the nature of these differences without giving evidence. I may say in partial exculpation, that my pupils and I have made many studies and collected much material on most of these points, and hope some day to publish our results.

Had I seen Mr. Knott's excellent defense of my view in the *Nation*, May 13, 1909, before writing this paper, I would not have written this terminal note. But as it contains a few points not presented by him, I will let it stand as written, with the addition of the three sentences noted above as coming from him.

